Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

SOVIET POWER AFTER TWENTY-FOUR YEARS

November 1917 to November 1941

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month
by R.P.D.

Political Outlook
(i) *by* T. L. HORABIN, M.P.
(ii) *by* S. SILVERMAN, M.P.

The 24th Anniversary
by IVOR MONTAGU

Shop Stewards on the Production Front
by G. A. HUTT

Prospects of British Science
by THALES

Book Reviews

NOVEMBER 1941 VOL. 23 No. 11

6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3 Telephone: FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Derelict Areas

Every reader of *Labour Monthly* who searched for the name of his own town or borough in the list set out in the October issue, of places where *Labour Monthly* Discussion Groups exist, and searched in vain, concluded perhaps that he dwelt in a politically derelict area. An area forsaken by the politically alert, by all except himself of those in whom the striving towards Socialism burns like an inextinguishable flame. And felt himself a lonely, enlightened being, miraculously surviving in the midst of unrelieved reaction without one twin soul to comfort him! But the absurdity of it! Precisely in those places where there is no organised or prominent left-wing activity, a Discussion Group is the beginning of effective political organisation. Men and women without contact of any sort with others of similar interests—some may be in the same street even—emerge from their isolation and discover their neighbourhood is not a derelict area at all. Let *all* those who think their particular areas "hopeless" send in their names to us. We'll have Discussion Groups established in a very short time, and our January list will then amount to the complete gazetteer of British towns and boroughs we aim to achieve.

GROUPS FORMED IN THE LAST TWO MONTHS:

Ashtead	Cowes	Greenwich	Renton
Barnsley	Charing Hill	Grays	St. Anne's-on-Sea
Biddulph	Cwmllynfell	Gt. Missenden	Swansea
Bingley	Enfield West	Hendon	Sedgley
Buckhaven	Farnborough	Holborn	Tonypandy
Bush Hill Park	Fawley	Hounslow	Trowbridge
Carlisle	Ferndale	Maidstone	Tylorstown
Cheam	Fulham	Middlesbrough	Westminster
Chingford (South)	Golders Green	Paisley	Westbury

Please send stamped addressed envelope with all enquiries.

NOTE.—Will all Conveners please notify us when there is a change of address?

Notes for Discussion Groups—published monthly—invaluable to individuals as well as to Groups. Subscription: 3s. per annum.

Discussion Groups Department,
LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

Anniversary in Battle—Twenty-Four Years for Freedom—Democratic Unity against Fascist Barbarism—From the English Revolution to the Russian Revolution—The Great Bourgeois Revolutions—The Significance of the Russian Revolution for the World—The Lesson of France and of the Soviet Union—Fight the Fifth Column—Hitler's Denunciation of Liberty and Equality—The Breaking Down of Barriers—End the Old Misunderstandings—Tributes from Former Critics—Honour to the New Civilisation—The Champion of the Freedom of Nations—They Fight for Us To-day—Harsh Lessons—Our Responsibilities.

"The time will come when the peoples will pronounce their weighty judgment on that mission of liberator which the Soviet Union, under the guidance of its great leader, Stalin, now performs—not only in the interests of the emancipation of the peoples of Europe, but in the interests of the peoples of the whole world—and which to-day is already so widely recognised by the representatives of friendly countries whose support we deeply understand and cherish."

MOLOTOV, speech at Three Power Conference, Moscow.

THE TWENTY-FOURTH anniversary of the foundation of the Soviet Union, and of that great Russian Revolution which opened a new epoch in human progress in the twentieth century even more profound and far-reaching in its effects than the great French Revolution of the end of the eighteenth century, falls in the gravest hour of the history of the world. It falls in the midst of mortal conflict, in a life-and-death struggle for the existence and future, not only of the Soviet Union, but of all human freedom against the deluge of barbarism and slavery which, begotten from the sordid origins of defence of privilege and oppression against the common people, now threatens to engulf the world in devastation and ruin, if all fighters for freedom without distinction do not unite to check it. The grim battle grows more grim. It will grow heavier yet, for all of us, before it is done. At last, all too slowly, the peoples of the West are beginning to awaken to the full seriousness and lightning urgency of the conflict, whose character the Soviet people have understood with clear vision and iron determination from the outset, and prepared for with limitless sacrifice and unswerving leadership, ever since Fascism established its barbarous regime

---

Vol. XXIII. No. 11. **CONTENTS FOR NOVEMBER** November, 1941.

	Page
Notes of the Month *Anniversary in Battle* *by* R.P.D.	437
The Ruby Star *by* IVOR MONTAGU	446
Political Outlook (i) .. *by* T. L. HORABIN, M.P.	449
(ii) .. *by* S. S. SILVERMAN, M.P.	452
Production—Key to Victory *by* ALLEN HUTT	456
Stalin: Leader of U.S.S.R. *by* V. MOLOTOV	460
World Scientists Against Fascism *by* THALES	463
Documents of the Month ..	466
Book Reviews— Honesty about the Colour Bar *by* LEONARD BARNES	467

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Germany. To-day that preparedness has proved the hope and the bastion of the world in the moment of greatest need. But that preparedness, which is to-day being expended with such colossal disregard of cost, is not enough without our action. The Nazi advance continues for four months. In the August issue of this journal we wrote: "The strength of the initial stand of the Soviet people against the onslaught of the Nazi military machine has given rise to the most dangerous false confidence and illusions here." To-day the advance of the enemy to threaten Moscow, the world capital of the common people, has begun to compel awakening from that false confidence and those illusions. There can be only one celebration of this anniversary: maximum common action to defeat the enemy by the united strength of the peoples.

FOR TWENTY-FOUR years the Soviet Union has fought in the vanguard of the nations: in the cause of freedom and security, not for the few, but for all its citizens; in the cause of the liberty and independence of nations, racial equality and the ending of all barriers of discrimination of colour, race or sex; in the cause of the emancipation of women; in the cause of social justice, so that none should lack work or leisure or social protection or protection in their conditions of labour, or the means for the development of personality; in the cause of educational, scientific and cultural progress on a scale the like of which has never before been seen; in the cause of technical advance, no longer in the service of money-making trusts, but in the service of the nation; in the cause of democracy, not merely formal democracy, but the active participation of all citizens in public affairs; in the cause of peace and the brotherhood of nations. For twenty-four years the Soviet people, those pioneers of humanity who, in Marx's deathless phrase describing the Paris Commune, have "stormed heaven," have striven with tireless initiative, audacity, heroism and enthusiasm, for the highest ideals which the most progressive thinkers and teachers of mankind have evolved through generations of development. To-day all that they have achieved, not for themselves alone, but for the world, and for the future of all of us, is endangered by the hordes of fascism, the apostles of inequality, of racial persecution, of the degradation of human personality, of the glorification of war and barbarism, of the systematic destruction of culture, of brutality and turning back the wheel of all civilised development.

BUT AT THE same time as this onslaught of the new barbarism is let loose with berserk fury upon the new civilisation, the peoples of all countries, equally of the older democratic countries menaced by fascism, and of the subject countries enslaved by fascism, are rallying to the common struggle side by side with the Soviet Union against the common enemy. During this moment of crisis old barriers of division and misunderstanding are breaking down. In the fires of war, and in the comradeship of common danger and a common struggle, a wider and deeper understanding is spreading in relation to the Soviet Union than at any time during these twenty-four years. Formidable as are the dangers which now surround the dauntless Soviet people on every side, the honour and the inspiration of their achievement never stood higher in the sight of the whole world. The imperishable example of Soviet heroism, capacity for sacrifice, staunchness of will and unity of an entire people, no less than the level of technical and military achievement, organisation, skill and leadership, have aroused a widespread desire to understand more of the kind of society which has made such "new standards of courage and endurance," as Mrs. Churchill has called them, such new high records for every nation to emulate, possible. The ready public for every meeting, for every book and pamphlet, and for every film which bears on the Soviet Union, illustrates this. There is a general recognition that the previous reporting or mis-reporting left public opinion unprepared for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

achievement which has been demonstrated in the sternest test to which any society can be subjected, the test of full-scale war. The present twenty-fourth anniversary should be utilised to spread among the widest sections, far beyond the circles of the left who have already followed with eager sympathy the achievements of the Soviet Union, this deeper understanding of the Soviet Union, what it stands for and its role in the world—an understanding which can yield rich and lasting results for the future of international relations and for the future of human co-operation.

THE SOVIET UNION embodies the outcome and experience of generations of struggle for human liberty. To understand the achievement of the Soviet Union, its significance in the world and the significance of the Russian Revolution which gave rise to it, it is not enough to trace the record of the past twenty-four years. The true record requires a larger canvas. It requires to be seen against the background of the whole accompanying world development. Its origins require to be traced through a long cycle of preceding development. Those origins can be traced through the epic of the Russian revolutionary struggle for liberty which for a century inspired all that was best in the Russian people. They can be traced through the long record of the international working class movement, which for the preceding century was building up its theory and organisation and practical lessons and achieved its first victory, on the basis of that international experience, in the Russian Revolution. But the line of descent in fact goes back further. The Russian Revolution was the heir and successor of the great bourgeois liberation movements which founded and shaped the modern world, when the bourgeoisie was the most progressive force in society and fought its battle against the fetters of the old dying social order in order to build a new and freer and more progressive order of society. The line of descent goes back to the French Revolution of the eighteenth century, which proclaimed the aims of liberty, equality and fraternity; to the American Declaration of Independence, which proclaimed the rights of man, the equality of men, and the derivation of government from the people; and to the English Revolution of three centuries ago, when the English people made the first decisive break with hereditary privilege, beheaded their King and established their Republic or Commonwealth, and the Russian Ambassador of that time was withdrawn in horror from the regicide nation.

THE GREAT BOURGEOIS revolutions initiated the modern struggle for human liberty. Their initiators and inspirers, their spokesmen and prophets, sought to end the servitude of man to man. Their ideal aims found expression in the line of revolutionary poets from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, from Milton to Shelley and Byron, to Goethe and Schiller and Victor Hugo. By ending the reign of kings and aristocrats they hoped to inaugurate the liberty and equality of all men as free and equal citizens. But the bourgeois revolutions could only achieve the first step to the realisation of these great ideals. They could not transcend their social limitations. They established formal liberty and equality. This was a great step forward. But subsequent experience soon showed that the power of wealth ran counter to the formal liberty and equality. What they destroyed in reality was feudal privilege and domination. But they did not yet end the division of classes and the servitude of man to man, although the new form of servitude based on the wage-contract was a step forward from the old forms of serfdom or slavery. The rule of one class, constituting a minority of society, replaced the rule of another. The rule of wealth replaced the rule of feudal privilege. The task remained to end the rule of wealth, in order to realise complete emancipation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THUS THE LESSON became clear to all who sought to carry forward the fight for liberty and real democracy that society must own its wealth, the means of production, before men can become free. This task could not be carried out by the bourgeoisie, which was based on the private ownership of property in the means of production. It could only be carried out by the new rising class, the working class, which was already divorced from any share in the ownership of the means of production, and which was at the same time by the conditions of its existence and struggle for life advancing to the new social principle of combination and solidarity. This was the lesson of experience, the theoretical outcome and development of the practical movement, which finally found realisation in the Russian Revolution. The Russian Revolution was the first social revolution, by which society became for the first time master of its own wealth, and means of production, and therefore made possible for the first time a completed democracy or real community of free men and women without division of classes. The suppression or dictatorship against the exploiters was only the engine to make possible this real democracy for the many. This was the magic seed from which has sprung all the subsequent flowering, alike in the marvellous social and economic achievements which have aroused the admiration of observers of every school of thought; in the transformation of the old feckless tumbledown Tsarist Russia within one generation into the New Russia of large-scale technique and a trained, skilled, competent population, which evoked the enthusiastic tribute of a Beaverbrook; or in the heroism, self-sacrifice, social solidarity and all the achievements of the Red Army, the guerilla fighters and the civilian population under the harsh ordeal of war, which have won the unstinted wonder of the world.

HOW COULD THE policy of the "scorched earth" be carried out in a corrupt disorganised France, even under the stress of invasion, where angry shareholders would have been the first to protest against any proposal to destroy their valuable property, while the peasantry would have felt the policy equivalent to a demand that they should destroy their only stake in the social order? Could France have destroyed a Dnieper Dam? Why, the all-powerful trust which would have owned such an enterprise in France (if it could ever have been built), would have been the first to demand and compel the cringing Government to leave their property secure and come to terms with the invaders in order to leave them in exploitation of their property, even at a cost, exactly as the owners of Schneider-Creusot or the Northern coalmines have done, while only the workers have sought to strike and sabotage in order to prevent them being worked for the benefit of Nazi Germany. How could there be any real national defence, when the workers rightly suspected the corrupt treacherous generals and politicians, and the upper classes feared their own working people more than they feared the foreign enemy?

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN the shameful collapse of France and the heroic stand of the Soviet Union before the assault of the same Nazi military machine is a terrible contrast between a divided, dying, decomposing society and a united people. It is not a contrast of two national characters; there is no more heroic and patriotic people than the French, as their past history has shown, and as they will show again, when the common people come into their own, and are, indeed, already showing in the struggle now rising against the foreign conquerors and their agents. The glorious record in war of the Soviet people is bound up with the social order they have built. We in Britain, though we have not yet achieved that same social order, need to learn much from the principles which animate the Soviet people. We need to ponder deeply the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lessons of France and the Soviet Union. We have to fight the Nazi machine now, unprepared as we are, with the existing social order and all the obstacles it creates to impede the fullest unity of the people in the struggle and most effective mobilisation of their strength. Only the most active role of the working people, the ruthless overriding of all vested interests, and the driving out in time of all traitors and Fifth Column elements from every commanding position, can save us from the type of fate symbolised in a France, and enable us to fulfil our role alongside the Soviet Union in the defeat of Nazi Germany.

HITLER IN HIS speech of October 3 referred with a sneer to "the principle of equal right for all embodied in the Soviet Union," and emphatically repudiated that principle for Nazi Germany: "This State is not ruled by the principle of equal right for all as the Soviet Union." That sneer revealed the gulf between two systems. But it revealed more. It revealed that Fascism not only repudiates the principles of the social order on which the Soviet Union is built. Fascism repudiates equally and at the same time the principles for which the bourgeois revolutions were fought. Fascism repudiates the principle of the liberty and equality of men. The fight against Fascism is a common fight which embraces equally the supporters of bourgeois democracy and of the social order which the Soviet Union represents, as it embraces all who stand for national independence against foreign enslavement. When Communist criticise bourgeois democracy, they criticise it from the standpoint of democracy, of the demand for more democracy, not less; they criticise, not the measure of democracy which has been achieved and which they unite to defend against attack, but the bourgeois limitations, the power of wealth which makes it incomplete. Fascism attacks all democracy without distinction. Against Fascism the struggle is a common struggle on the part of all who recognise the most elementary principles of democracy and the rights of man. The alliance of the Western democracies and the Soviet Union opens the way to a deeper understanding between the Western peoples and the Soviet Union and the clearing away of misconceptions which have caused needless barriers in the past.

ON THE SAME day as Hitler's speech, on October 3, the *Times*, in an editorial on the Three Power Conference, made a declaration worthy of note:

> "Very great difference of social structure and political thought divide the three members of the new confederacy. The growth of mutual understanding which will flow naturally from the process of combined action will moderate these differences, though it will doubtless not obliterate them altogether. We have already learnt that these differences are of quite another order from those which divide us from Hitlerism. A common detestation of that barbarous creed has brought home to us what we have in common with our new brothers-in-arms; and starting from that negative basis we have already learnt that our positive ideals overlap more than we had thought . . .
>
> "From time to time there has been a tendency among well-intentioned planners to assume that international organisation and co-operation after the war should be restricted by tests of orthodoxy in the faith of congressional or parliamentary government. It was a dangerous tendency, for it threatened in the long run to range along a line of artificial or at least unnecessary division those whose fundamental interests and ideals are wholly compatible."

Such a declaration from such a source is a symptom of obvious importance in relation to the new currents of thought which are developing from the present situation. Similarly on October 5 the Archbishop of Canterbury could declare, not only that "we might well be proud of our new Allies," but that

> "we had something to learn from Russia in the bold and far-seeing planning of economic resources for the good of the whole community."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THESE DECLARATIONS ARE important, not because they could be taken as implying any change of basic outlook on the part of the social forces represented by the *Times* or the Archbishop of Canterbury, but because they do reflect a recognition of the consequences arising from the present international alignment and of the new processes of thought developing among wide sections of opinion under the impact of the mighty events of the present conflict and the trial of social systems in the ordeal of battle. The reflection may still be mirrored in a glass darkly; but the reflection is visible. Just as the Bolshevik Revolution gave rise to Wilson's Fourteen Points (prepared in response to Sisson's urgent message from Russia), so the participation of the Soviet Union in the war immediately led to the replacement of the previous refusal of any declaration of war aims by the Atlantic Charter. The practical outcome depends on the action of the peoples. It is of the greatest importance that the politically conscious representatives of the working class movement should recognise the new possibilities which arise from the new situation to reach out and develop understanding among sections not previously reached; for the new stirrings can also develop into unfavourable channels, unless the representatives of the working class movement are able to give leadership.

FIERCE AS HAVE been the controversies which have blazed around the Soviet Union since its inception, the solid record of constructive achievement, alike at home and in its leadership in world affairs, has won increasing tributes even from among many of those who were originally its most vehement critics. Within the labour movement an intense controversy has raged in relation to the Soviet Union. But by the time of the twentieth anniversary, in 1937, it was the principal theoretical representative on the Continent of the reformist school of criticism, Otto Bauer, who declared, after his own alternative path to socialism had suffered such conspicuous shipwreck:

> "The Social Revolution which Soviet Power has accomplished has not its like in the whole history of the world. Capitalists and big landlords are expropriated. A powerful industry, which belongs not to any capitalist but to the State as the representative of the whole people, has been built up. Peasant holdings have been collectivised. In the Kolhozes a new form of co-operative peasant villages which until recently were cultivated in the most primitive manner are now worked by tractors and sown with highly cultivated seed: the harvest is brought in by combine-harvesters. The doors of the higher schools are flung wide open to the sons of workers and peasants; out of the womb of the working class and the peasantry has emerged a new generation of political and economic leaders, of engineers and agronomists, doctors and teachers, scholars and artists. Great strides have been made in the struggle against illiteracy; nations with no history have been freed from oriental fetters and awakened to new cultural life; the hunger of the masses for culture has increased to an incredible degree. It is true that a new civilisation has arisen in these twenty years."
>
> (Otto Bauer in "*Der Kampf*," November, 1937).

This is the civilisation which is now battered and befouled on by the filthy hordes of fascism.

IN BRITAIN THE former leaders for decades of the opposing school of thought within the labour movement, the Webbs, have in their later years become the most enthusiastic exponents of the social principles embodied in the Soviet Union. Their book, "Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation," originally published in 1935, has become a classic of descriptive exposition for Western readers of the principles and structure of the Soviet Union. The re-issue of this book with a new introduction at the present moment is welcome; as it affords an illuminating picture, despite differences of theoretical outlook, for the general reader in Britain and the United States who comes without previous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equipment and with all the misconceptions which have been so freely spread in all the conventional treatment for the past twenty-four years. In this account they give a powerful and detailed picture of the gigantic achievement of the Soviet Union, which is especially valuable for bringing out in the most vivid and concrete form its ultra-democratic character as what they term

> "a multiform democracy in which soviets and trade unions, co-operative societies and voluntary associations provide for the personal participation in public affairs of an unprecedented proportion of the entire adult population."

On the significance of the Russian Revolution they draw the conclusion:

> "Future generations will estimate the worthwhileness of national conquests or internal revolutions, not so much by the temporary misery that they inevitably create, but largely according to the relative social value, in each case, of the new order in comparison with the old. In the U.S.S.R. the substantial completion of the liquidation of the landlord and capitalist, together with the coincident abandonment by the western Powers of their original project of armed intervention to suppress Soviet Communism, have not only made humanity to individuals at last socially safe, but have also witnessed a considerable building up of new social tissue, and the purposeful reorganisation of community life on a deliberate plan for the Remaking of Man."

To-day all this achievement, which has won the universal tribute of all progressive thought, is menaced anew by the barbarous assault of the most formidable engine of reactionary despotism which the Western world has yet created, the prospect of which renewed assault the authors of this book (but not the leaders of the Soviet Union) too lightly discounted. But the conflict has come about under such conditions that the Soviet Union is not without allies, and the way is opened for the peoples of the world to unite with the Soviet Union in the task of the complete destruction of Fascism.

IN WORLD AFFAIRS the leadership of the Soviet Union has won the universal tribute of the widest sections of progressive opinion in all countries. The example of the complete renunciation of all the old imperialist claims of Tsarism, and the emancipation and full equality of all the nations within its borders, has led to the solution of the national problem within a multi-national State on lines whose success has been demonstrated by the complete unity of the peoples within the Soviet Union in the present struggle, and the unmitigated failure of every attempt of fascist penetration to find a foothold of national discontent. The consistently pacific policy throughout these twenty-four years was signally demonstrated in those proposals for total disarmament fourteen years ago, whose refusal on the part of all the other Powers marked the beginning of the new armaments race to war. The support of every nation struggling for independence against aggression has been again and again demonstrated, whether in relation to Turkey, or China, or Abyssinia, or Spain, or Czechoslovakia. Above all, during the critical years of advancing fascist aggression and war over the world, the Soviet Union's statesmanship, diplomacy and consistent and courageous fight for a collective stand of the peoples represented a policy which, had it been backed by the other Powers, would, it is to-day universally recognised, have prevented the present war. The Soviet Union is especially dear to all colonial peoples. It was Sun Yat Sen, the great leader of the Chinese Revolution, who from his deathbed in 1925 addressed his famous letter to the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. as the champion of all oppressed peoples: "You stand at the head of the Union of Free Peoples and the heritage which the immortal Lenin left to all oppressed people." It was Tagore who paid his eloquent tribute to the Soviet Union from the heart of the Indian people: "There is no separating line of mistrust or insulting distinctions between Soviet Europe and Soviet Asia." It is a Paul Robeson who speaks from the heart of the African people. And Madame Chiang Kai Shek, no friend of Communism, recently placed on record (in the American journel, "Liberty,"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on December 21, 1940): "Intellectual honesty constrains me to point out that, throughout the first three years of resistance Soviet Russia extended to China for the actual purchase of war materials and other necessities credits several times larger in amount than the credits given either by Great Britain or America." To-day the Soviet Union, the friend and protector of all nations, can look with right and confidence for their support in the colossal struggle which it has now to wage, not only for its own existence, but for the freedom of all nations.

TO-DAY THE SOVIET people, who by their own unaided efforts and in the face of innumerable obstacles at home and abroad have built up their own free society, vanquished all their enemies at home and solved the problems and inherited evils of the old order, turned a wilderness and a jungle into a garden of abundance, progress and comradeship, and could by now with justice have looked for a little ease to enjoy the fruits of their labours, have instead to see the outcome of their creative labours destroyed by the new barbarians from the West, and have to confront, with their own bodies, and at limitless sacrifice, the most loathsome outcome and abortion of the old decomposing society, solely because we in the West during these twenty-four years have failed to deal with our own enemies and have allowed this monster to grow up. The flower of the entire new generation of socialist youth, born and bred in the conditions of the new society, having no part or lot, or even previous direct knowledge of the filth and the cruelties, the crimes and the follies of the old barbarous class society which begets poverty and war, have now to give their lives in fighting its most fiendish and formidable outcome, on behalf of all of us, because we have been too weak to do our part and prevent its growth. The thought of that must the more steel our determination to do our part to-day. They are facing their part without flinching and without repining. All the marvellous creative powers of the new society are now turned to the tasks of war. But the cost and the sacrifice is heavy beyond computation. The mounting total of casualties in four months leaves the total of casualties of this country in two years of war a tiny fraction in comparison. The losses of tanks and planes and guns are on a scale that makes the total war output of this country and the United States look a pigmy affair. So long as the Soviet Union fights alone, with the entire Nazi power concentrated on one front, the deadly Nazi advance continues. Industrial destruction increases their advantage. The Soviet resistance and sacrifices have won a short-lived, costly and in the end illusory immunity for the West. The price of acquiescence in that partial and temporary immunity will be heavy. The menace grows more urgent with each step forward of the Nazi advance. It is the more necessary to face our responsibilities.

THERE IS NO mystery about the Nazi advance. The harsh truth must be faced that our inaction has helped to make it possible, has even reinforced the Nazi numbers, releasing half a million men for Hitler's supreme offensive on the Eastern front. The harsh truth must be faced that, despite all the limitless heroism, sacrifices and preparedness of the entire Soviet people, the enemy has at present superiority of forces and equipment, so long as the battle is against the Soviet Union in isolation. The most formidable military machine of tyranny the world has ever known, which has swept over every other country of Europe and routed in a few weeks every other army that has faced it, is now turned, with redoubled strength from its conquests, against the Soviet Union; and the four months of continuing, unceasing and ever intensified battle is a measure of the strength, resistance and unbreakable will of the Soviet people. The Nazi rulers are able to draw on the life and labours of two hundred and seventy millions of people in all the highly developed and super-industrialised regions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Western and Central Europe. They are able to drive the armies of satellite nations into the battle, while Japan threatens action in the Far East, and is able thereby to immobilise, and possibly in the near future to engage, a whole sector of Soviet forces. They are able to draw on, not only the gigantic arms factories of Germany, the most technically advanced country in the world already before the Nazis came to power, and turned by them into the most ruthlessly organised slave factory for war and war production, but simultaneously and in addition on Schneider-Creusot, on Skoda, on Bofors, on all the arsenals of Europe, which would have formerly equipped both sides of a European war, and all now turned to let loose an avalanche of metal against the Soviet Union with its industrial productive resources diminished by the loss of territory.

THE PRE-WAR measures of output of Nazi Europe and the Soviet Union tell their own tale:

	Nazi Europe	U.S.S.R.
Steel (million tons)	44.7	18.1
Pig Iron and Ferro Alloys (million tons)	37.3	14.7
Coal (million tons)	328	123
Sulphuric Acid (1,000 tons)	4,992	1,208
Electricity (1,000 million k.w. hours)	124.5	36.4

(League of Nations figures for 1937 and 1938; table compiled in "Labour Research," October, 1941).

These are harsh figures. But they must be faced. They dispose of any myth of Nazi invincible military magic, and show the very solid material and technical basis of the advance achieved. But they show very plainly the responsibility of the role of this country and the United States. Only the combined strength of Britain, the United States and the U.S.S.R., and not of any one separately, can finally break the Nazi power. The alternative is defeat by division. This is the most important practical lesson for us on the present anniversary.

R. P. D.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.
The articles in the LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.
WHOLESALE:
LABOUR MONTHLY is obtainable from W. H. Smith & Son, Ltd., and all other wholesalers (full Federation terms), and may be *ordered* through W. H. Smith's branches or any newsagent.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 12 months 7s.; 6 months 3s. 6d. Postage paid.

ALL BOOKS
MENTIONED IN LABOUR MONTHLY or any other paper can be obtained at
COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS,
66, CHARING CROSS ROAD, LONDON, W.C. 2
Temple Bar 6306
GLASGOW—1a, DUNDAS ST., C.I., DOUGLAS 1951
MANCHESTER—13/15a, HANGING DITCH, 4. BLACKFRIARS 8334
MAIL ORDER DEPARTMENT
67, GREAT RUSSELL ST., LONDON, W.C.I. HOLBORN 3222

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ruby Star

by **IVOR MONTAGU**

TWENTY-FOUR years ago took place the October Revolution. Twenty-four years ago humanity was stirred by events in Russia as it is stirred to its depths to-day. Twenty-four years ago the gloom of a world engulfed in war, the chaos of a society shaken to its foundation, the despair of mankind suffering without visible reason for, or end to, its sufferings, was lit by the lightning flash of a new possibility and a new hope. Twenty-four years ago.

As to-day.

To-day the blinding and staggering truth is manifest to everyone. There is one bulwark that can bear the brunt. There is one hope on which all hope resides. There is one king-pin on which civilisation and the future of humanity depends. The Soviet Union. Victorious —and the vistas of all progress open out. Defeat it —and not all is lost, the cause is never lost, but the books of mankind are closed up, freedom is chained, the chapter of hope deferred, the agony of generations of subterranean struggle imposed upon us, our children and our children's children.

There is no one who does not see it. There is not even anyone who does not say it. Editors, bishops, Tory Cabinet Ministers —with whatever ungracious trimmings of stored hatred at the compelled admission—are all obliged to acknowledge what is obvious and undeniable to the plain man.

But the situation thus illumined by the inescapable considerations of war strategy is not an accident deriving from them. It is the plain fact that has been equally fact ever since that November day* twenty-four years ago, that the fortunes of mankind, the realisation of its millennia of aspirations, are linked to the fate of the adventure begun upon that day. *The only novelty is that now this truth begins to be perceptible to all.*

"All depends upon sustaining the Soviet Union." This is the theme of every contemporary speech, of every leading article. But everything, *literally everything*, ever since its birth has so depended. This may be a new discovery (though not to all), it is not a new truth.

* October 25th, old style.

Every feature of Soviet resistance that has quickened the pulse of admiration, that has forced grudging praise from the lips of its most consistent detractors, that has engraved new standards of skill, heroism and sacrifice on the tablets of history—all this springs from Socialism, all this derives from the release to human energies and potentialities effected by the attainment of working-class power, all was implicit on that November Day, all has been realised by the unflinching loyalty to its principles that has perpetually inspired the effort of the Soviet peoples, the guidance of the Bolshevik party, the leadership of Stalin.

Count these features.

The unity of the Soviet people, the fact that there are no classes with interests that conflict with one another, no wavering class to seek through surrender a mirage of self interests—*as exists in every other country in the world.* This is unique. It springs from Socialism and the elimination of classes.

(How far-sighted, and what a source of strength, was the elimination of the village influence of the kulaks, and what a sheet-anchor to-day for the safety of all humanity, including the British people !)

The patriotism of the Soviet people, the absence of a "subject race," made by racial favouritism and oppression hostile, or an object of seduction by the piecrust promises of the enemy. This absence of envy, this solidarity does not exist, never has existed, in any other multi-national state. It springs from the Socialist internationalism of the working class.

The scorched earth, the love of country that denies to the enemy any advantage from territorial advance, that destroys all, rather than let its use strengthen the foe to enable him to capture more. This—plain logical common sense for the patriot—is as far beyond the comprehension of the leaders of capitalist society, for whom his private property, his *real* estate, far transcends the intangibles of the public weal, as Stalin's speech on the subject is from the invasion pamphlet, "Stay put," or the Metropolitan Water Board's instructions to preserve the London water system intact for the benefit of any

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enemy who might invade. Such patriotism springs and can spring only from the sense of real brotherhood of the nation that comes from Socialism.

The mechanised might that withstands Hitler's 30,000 tanks. This springs from the Five Years Plan that for all time transformed the Soviet Union from the economic backwardness of an undeveloped colony.

(Who has forgotten those sneers, divided between "impractical" and "unnecessary" from the leaders of that great industrial nation, which, in its hour of need, sent its sons out to fight for it equipped with only twenty-four tanks of heavier armament than one machine gun ?) *

The inexhaustible distant reserves—the harvest of grain gathered before the arrival of the onrushing German spearheads. In how many press columns a day, do not "optimists" comfort themselves with the thought that even if invasion penetrate through the great industrial districts, a Soviet army in being can still stand between the menace and the writers' own homes, based on the developed war industries distributed in the Urals and beyond. To whose foresight is this due but to the *planning* that non-Marxists used to say was based on foolish forebodings and which in any case is impossible under capitalism with its powerful competing claims? Without agricultural collectivisation, the vigour of which fools joined with enemies in condemning, it could never have been possible to gather the food resources in time, and thus prevent a famine, that would have crippled the strength of the Ally on whom to-day the world depends.

The mechanised steel, that drives and repairs the tractors and the planes. Could any other system but Socialism invoke in less than a generation, out of the "dark" intellect of the Moujik the "Russians with their genius for mechanisation" of whom Beaverbrook speaks ?

(If it could, then account, if you can, or if you dare, for the rapid progress of the Indian people from 90 odd plus point something per cent. illiteracy to 90 odd plus an invisible fraction less—after one hundred years of British rule).

The sacrifice, the energy, the initiative, the days on end at the bench, the multiplication of productivity by hundreds per cent., which, whatever the *will* to sacrifice, can only spring freely and easily from the industrial plan where the ever-haunting spectre of future unemployment has been banished, where the crippling knowledge of the existence of a profit made by another out of the devoted sacrifice of each, of the existence of hampering controls to increase and safeguard future private profit, has—through Socialism—long disappeared.

In this hour of peril to the Soviet Union and the world, the recognition of Soviet achievement is accompanied by the vanishing into limbo of the libels on the Soviet Union, the drying-up of the slanders and their evaporation with the wind.

What is left of the stories of a starving and pitiable intimidated "serf" population, but an anger among those of the deceived British and other peoples who swallowed them and a determination never to trust again those who told them such tales?

What think the British airmen in Karelia beside their Red Air Force comrades, or the British troops, soldiers and officers alike, beside the Red Army men in Iran—of the Labour delegates to Finland who told them tales of brutish ignorance and cracked boots?

What think the British and European peoples in the midst of these terrible calamities, of those of their leaders who told them collaboration with the Soviet Union to avert war was unimportant, since all Soviet tanks were made of cardboard and all Soviet aeroplanes painted upon glass?

Who to-day would, if they could, bring to life again the traitors and Fifth Columnists who plotted with sabotage and assassination to yield Soviet land to Hitler out of fear and weakness ? Who would, if they could, resurrect one yard of the Mannerheim Line ? Who to-day, in Britain as in Sovietland, does not breathe the more easily for the extermination of the one and the annihilation of the other?

Who to-day does not blush with shame at the veil of "democratic" glamour cast by leading figures of the British labour, Trade Union and Co-operative movement around the White Guard Finnish Fascists, allies and intimates of Hitler, reckless plungers of their people into the doom of starvation and new slaughter for a war of conquest, bandits leagued in murder, theft and arson, as a British Cabinet Minister* names them ?

* See Gort's dispatches.

* Beaverbrook.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who is there that does not recall the miserable Trotskyist drivel, peddled in liberal journals that should have known a hundred times better, to the effect that "Stalin" avoided war because he knew that "to place arms in the hands of the people would lead instantly to the overthrow of his regime," only to vomit with anger and disgust, dumb before the grandeur of the spectacle of universal adult military training and military arming of a whole population without distincton of sex—the final and most complete example and guaranteee of democracy, the test and trust cited by Lenin and by Marx (a measure that non-Socialist democracy does not dare venture, not only in its imperial possessions, but even in its homeland here in Britain)?

Who is there to-day who does not understand not only the wisdom but the necessity, in the interest not only of the Soviet people but of the peoples of the entire world, of the skilful Foreign Policy that has ensured this testing time coming now and not then—now when American isolation has become weakened, French Fascism an object of contempt, and pre-Dunkirk British military illusions salutarily battered, now when the self-interest and exposed weakness of would-be hostile capitalist groups in Britain and U.S.A. *obliges* them to support, and not then, when the surety of such support would merely have been the paper promises on which such as China, Abyssinia and Czechoslovakia relied?

What to-day is the whole edifice of malign discrediting of Stalin? Dust and less than dust. What British man or woman, what man or woman throughout the world, does not sleep more easily, labour and fight with new confidence, because Stalin is at the helm—who would not feel the perils encompassing himself and his dearest increased ten thousand fold were that great guidance gone?

What, after this twenty-four years, affords increased hope for mankind is the fact that this patent grandeur of the U.S.S.R. looms not as a static picture to be admired, but as an encouragement of what is possible, an example urging to emulation.

It can be done.

What would happen in the Soviet Union to a Minister who expressed the wish that ally versus common enemy in the struggle should mutually exhaust themselves, to an Ambassador who aided the enemy by revealing in public the military intention to make no strategic diversion, to a War Minister who defended the idleness of his army during the greatest and most decisive battle of all time on the ground that a small part of it was being helpful in getting in the harvest, to the nest of worse than traitors such as those who prepared an army to fight in the conditions described in Gort's report?

What would happen in the Soviet Union to officers who set their skilled rank and file to build them a golf course, to papers that printed advertisements to attract man and woman power into domestic service of a dozen waiting on "two in a family," to merchants who marketed food substitutes containing .0001 per cent. of any substance acknowledgeable as food, to factory managements who refused to discuss with workpeople the overcoming of bottle-necks or forced idleness, to work-people who refused the speediest possible training to the highest attainable degree of skill for every working hand without distinction of sex?

The question has only to rise, as it does in a myriad minds together with the answer known to all, for the realisation to come with it: *What they have done, we can do; we too can resist the invader, our nation too can exert its full strength*—for the confidence to come in Britain and America that these weights upon our muscles can be broken and cast off, for the inspiration to burn in the occupied territories of Europe that no obstacle is too great to be overcome, no fortress of power untakeable.

It is not only what the Soviet Union is doing, to-day after twenty-four years, that makes it the pilot light of the world, but what it stands for, now plain and inescapable. The ruby star above the Kremlin gleams in the hearts of men, warning and calling to action more millions than ever before, inextinguishable whatever the passing tides of battle, the jewel of victory for mankind.

ERRATUM.—In the October number, p. 433, the Chairman of the Trades Union Congress should be Mr. Wolstencroft.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Political Outlook

In view of the urgency of the present situation the LABOUR MONTHLY *has approached political representatives for contributions on their views as to the steps to be taken. We have pleasure in printing below contributions from the Liberal M.P., Mr. T. L. Horabin, and from the Labour M.P., Mr. S. S. Silverman. The views set forth are those of the contributors and should not be regarded as expressing the standpoint of the* LABOUR MONTHLY.

(i) *by* T. L. HORABIN, M.P.

Urgent Political Tasks

AS I write this article the people of Britain are profoundly disturbed. Timoshenko's army is battling for its very existence. Moscow may fall. The Donetz basin, the main production area of Russia may be lost—and, Britain, after two years of war, is apparently so impotent that she can strike no military blow at Hitler to relieve our Russian ally. The British people have a full understanding of the fundamentals of the situation. Russia's battle is our battle. Our fate, no less than Russia's fate, is being decided on the Eastern front.

Some members of the War Cabinet are reported to believe that if Russia goes out of the fight we shall be no worse off than before Hitler attacked Russia. Such views are rank blithering lunacy. The holders of them betray an inability to grasp the most elementary principles of war which totally unfits them for any part whatsoever in the conduct of the war. Hitler himself has said that the mere fact that Russia, neutral as she was, stood intact at his back, prevented him throwing the whole of his forces against us last year. If Russia goes now, next year there will be no deterrent. For us to send supplies of raw materials and equipment to Russia is of vital importance in the long run. Such help is of no importance in the present critical battles. Indeed, the only way of helping Russia in her present agony—and if she goes down now, anything we can do next year is of no avail—is to force Hitler to withdraw a substantial number of his divisions from the Eastern front at once. That can only be done by forming another front at once somewhere between North Cape and the Dardanelles. We have the whole coast line of Europe to play with. Such an expedition may result ultimately in another Dunkirk. It may mean a worse disaster than Dunkirk, because we may lose all the men engaged in it, as well as the equipment. Would that matter? Would that be too great a sacrifice to make, as long as it kept Russia in the war and capable of offensive action in the future? Let ue not forget that in the last war, the Russian defeat at Tannenberg enabled the French and British armies to win the battle of the Marne on the Western Front. Russia's sacrifice at Tannenberg saved the Allies from overwhelming defeat in the early stages of the Great War. Besides the risk that such a sacrifice entails now may well obviate much heavier sacrifices later. Wars are lost, not won, by refusal to face up to justifiable risks.

Is the British Government going to act now, or are we to witness a repetition of the tragedy that has laid Europe prostrate at the feet of Hitler? The tragedy of this war has been the failure of the Governments of countries threatened by Fascism to present a common front to Hitler. If in 1938 Russia, France and Britain had made it clear that further aggression would have been resisted by all three, there would have been no Munich. If Russia, France and Britain had stood together in 1939, there would have been no war. Unfortunately the French and British Governments and governing classes thought that Russia, as a communist country, constituted a greater threat to their existence than Hitlerite Germany. Only after Russia had proved her military capacity by deeds did the British Government and governing classes abandon their preconceived idea that Russia, from the military point of view, was worthless as an ally.

All this, however, belongs to the past

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and it is no good crying over spilt milk. France, like every other European country, has collapsed before the strength and purpose of Hitlerite Germany. Hitler, with contemptuous appraisal of British ability to interfere with him—a contempt that is being thoroughly justified by the result—has turned the whole of his strength against Russia. The Russians have shown that, unlike all the other European countries including ourselves, they have made the necessary preparations, the necessary sacrifices, to defend their country. Government and people alike are fighting like demons against the German Fascists, which is very much more than any other country in Europe has attempted to do. For the first time, casualties in this war have not only equalled, but have actually surpassed those experienced in the last war. But German strength may be too much for Russia to stand up against alone. If only we could force Hitler to withdraw 25 or 30 divisions from the Russian front to turn them against us, the situation on the Russian front might be transformed. The balance between victory and defeat is decisively turned by such factors as this.

Why have we not acted already? After all we have had plenty of time. The Prime Minister told us last June that he had foreseen Hitler's attack on Russia and had warned Stalin. Why then had the British Government not prepared to take full advantage of such a fortunate concatenation of circumstances? Of one thing I am sure. We have in Winston Churchill a win-the-war Prime Minister. He has the necessary ruthless drive and iron determination to battle through to victory. While we have a win-the-war Prime Minister, the plain fact of the matter is we have a lose-the-war Government, which dissipates the Prime Minister's drive and determination, so that Britain today suffers from a paralysis of the will akin to that which paralysed France and prevented her bringing her full strength to bear against Hitler. The present British Government is a lose-the-war Government, because it is a coalition with the representatives of all three parties included in the administration in proportion to the parliamentary strength of the parties. In other words, Ministers are not selected because of their capacity, their ruthlessness and their drive, which are the only qualifications for office in a war administration. Instead, they are selected for their standing in the hierarchy of their party, which has nothing to do with administrative capacity. As a result of this set-up, the Government seeks to fight the war by a series of compromises between the vested interests represented by the party hierarchies. For instance, everyone recognises that to defeat Hitler, every man, woman and machine in this country must work all out on the war effort. Yet Ministers have exercised no compulsion over industry, while compulsion of workers has been introduced piecemeal as scandals of underproduction—in the docks, the shipyards and the mines—have forced themselves on public attention. So the Minister of Labour is now committed up to the hilt to compulsion of workers without any quid pro quo from the employers in the shape of compulsion of industry, which is equally vital to the war effort.

I am sure that the continuance of Mr. Churchill as Prime Minister is essential to victory, but I am equally sure that unless he reconstructs his Government by appointing men to high office selected solely for their capacity, ruthlessness and drive and without regard to party affiliations, he will not only imperil his own position as Prime Minister, but he will also jeopardise our chances of ultimate victory. In carrying out such a reconstruction, Mr. Churchill would find that he not only has the full support of the people, but of the House of Commons as well. It must be realised that the representatives of the parties were not selected by the back benchers any more than by the rank and file of the parties. They are the nominees of party machines over which neither the back benchers nor the rank and file have any practical control, unless they revolt against them. In fact, back benchers of all parties realise that some at least of their representatives in the Government are quite unfitted for their jobs.

I have heard many people say that Mr. Churchill is a bad judge of men. The facts all point the other way. Where he has selected men unfettered by party considerations, he has chosen men of capacity, ruthlessness and drive. Beaverbrook, Bracken and Leathers are three men of the Prime Minister's own unfettered choice. However much one may disagree with their politics, from the point of view of the war effort, each one of them shows a refreshing determination to get things done regardless of anything

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or anyone. I have also heard many people say that we are suffering from a dearth of capable men and that it will be impossible to replace the existing team by as good a one, let alone a better. To such a defeatist view I cannot subscribe. The men are available if they are selected by the only standard that matters, their ability to carry out a policy of ruthless drive to victory. Besides a number of the present Ministers would do excellent work transferred to the right jobs in a Government determined to wage the war regardless of clogging, hampering vested interests.

What are the policies that such a win-the-war Government must carry out to enable us to present an impregnable front to Hitler?

In the first place, a government composed of men selected by the Prime Minister for their capacity to carry out a ruthless win-the-war policy would immediately rid the country of that paralysis of the will which enables Hitler to disregard us at this moment with such contempt. They would put the experts, whether military or civil servants, in their right place as advisers and not as censors of policy. The whole tendency in the civil service, as a result of the enervating influence of the series of so-called National Governments, has been to promote to key positions men who are always able to find convincing reasons for not carrying out any decisive policy. Such an attitude of mind on the part of the civil service is fatal in war, when ruthless, positive action is required in pursuit of definite policies. In the second place such a government would result in a war cabinet capable of sharing with the Prime Minister the responsibility for taking those risks inseparable from the conduct of vigorous offensive warfare. Such responsibilities are too much to be shouldered by any one man.

The policies that such a government must carry out are simple in principle. They become complicated only if vested interests are not ruthlessly disregarded in pursuit of the fundamental interests of the community as a whole. These, then, are the policies which, in my view, a win-the-war government must pursue if we are to achieve victory.

All men and youths must be trained to fight in defence of their districts should invasion come upon us. In totalitarian war, the civilian has a dual function. He must work his hardest in factory, field or office, producing essential goods, equipment and services, but he must also be trained to defend his hearth, if necessary with his life's blood, should the enemy come his way.

Then civilian consumptions must be cut to the bone by comprehensive rationing. Every article of civilian consumption should be rationed to the minimum necessary to maintain the health, strength and energy of the people for them to play their full part in the war effort. Non-essentials should be ruthlessly cut out. Comprehensive rationing on this basis would achieve two vitally important results. Productive capacity, now unnecessarily utilised for producing goods and services for civilian consumption, would be freed for absorption into the war effort. A sound basis for securing equality of sacrifice would be achieved. No one, however well off they may be, would be able to purchase more than their "iron ration." The new Government would have to go further than that. To-day many people, amongst them not a few dependants of service men and many old-age pensioners, do not possess the means to purchase their share of rationed foods and clothing. If there is comprehensive rationing there cannot be inflation, because however much purchasing power there may be in the hands of the people, they cannot purchase more than their ration. Therefore the Government would be in a position to provide every man, woman and child in the country with the means to buy their rations. For instance, instead of the allowances for the dependants of serving men being made upon a "relief" basis similar to the system of relief of poverty, allowances could, as they should, be based on the pre-war earnings of the service man, subject to a minimum to enable them to purchase their rations. If Hitler can pay the dependants of serving men their peace-time earnings up to approximately £20 a month, we are in a far better position to do the same. Commitments such as building society payments, insurance premiums and excessive rents should be dealt with as in Germany either by scaling down or by subsidy. Then there should be compensation for those who suffer greater sacrifices than the rest of the community as a result of the war effort, such as small shopkeepers and people bombed out of their work or their businesses. Compensation should, of course, be subject to the recipients taking up any work of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national importance to which they are directed.

Having by these measures ensured real equality of sacrifice, the Executive would be in a position to carry out the powers that were given to the present Government at the outset of its career. They would be able to exercise compulsion over all persons and property without inflicting unfair hardship on anyone. It is fantastic that even now, in the third year of war, the Government should be appealing to unmarried women to volunteer for war service, and should be allowing men to carry on with work of no national importance whatsoever. Compulsion of man-power is necessary for us to bring our war production up to the greatest possible level. Unless we reach that level, then we have no hope of catching up the production of Nazi Germany and of providing the Russians with the quantities of equipment they must ultimately require from us. Similarly there must be conscription of industry and property. To secure the most effective use of plant, management and labour there must be pooling of industries, if necessary financed by the Government. Only so can industrialists be expected to participate whole-heartedly in the war effort. While industries are run as private enterprises, the managements and proprietors cannot subordinate the interest of the private business to the paramount national interest. In participating in the war effort they must think of what the effect is likely to be on their business after the war.

When I have expressed these views, I have been told that conscription of persons and property on these lines means dictatorship. I have been told that I am proposing to substitute for democracy the very thing against which we are fighting. I have even been told by some people that if to win the war we must introduce Nazi methods into this country, then we have lost the war anyhow, so why bother to fight. These objections are based on unsound reasoning born of self-interest. Is it undemocratic for our soldiers, our airmen and our sailors to be conscripted to risk their lives for democracy? Of course it is not. If it is not undemocratic for our service men to be conscripted to risk their most precious possession, whatever their social standing, it is surely no more undemocratic for labour to be conscripted for war work, and it is even less undemocratic to conscript industrial plants and other property. Totalitarian war can be fought successfully only by total means. We are fighting an enemy completely organised for total war. To meet his challenge effectively we must be no less completely organised.

Even if we do succeed in organising ourselves on a totalitarian basis for total war—and without that sacrifice we cannot win—there is still a vital distinction between totalitarian democracy in this country and totalitarian Fascism in Germany and Italy. In the Fascist countries, individual freedom disappeared even before economic freedom was curtailed. In Britain, individual freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, freedom to criticise the executive continue to survive and will continue side by side with a totalitarian economy. That is why I think the Government made a profound mistake in suppressing the *Daily Worker*. That is why I voted against the Government on this issue. That is why I think it important that the Government should now lift the ban on the *Daily Worker*. If side by side with a totalitarian economy we ensure that minorities have freedom to express their views, but not to take action that will interfere with the will of the majority, then democracy is safe. We can then surrender, for the period of the war, the right to do what we like with our property or to offer our labour where we will, confident that the workings of our democratic system will restore those rights when the war and its aftermath are over. Personally, I hope that an overwhelming majority of the people of this country will by that time have sense enough so to re-cast our economic system that every man, woman and child enjoys freedom from poverty and economic fear, and there is an end to that social privilege which has brought us to our present pass. All that, however, belongs to the future. Our immediate task is to make the sacrifice imperatively necessary to enable us and our Russian Ally to defeat Hitler decisively.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(ii) *by* S. SYDNEY SILVERMAN, M.P.

Time is Short

THE 22nd of June, 1941, changed the face of the war. It might have changed the face of the world: it may still. But after four months of the most heroic fighting in history Hitler's Nazi hordes are, as I write, at the gates of Moscow: Leningrad maintains its devoted resistance but is completely invested; it is unsure whether Odessa has fallen or not; Kieff has gone; the best of the Soviet Union's industrial areas are out of production; the ratio, both of men and material, alters progressively in the enemy's favour. There is no form of historical error so gratuitous as prophecy. I therefore prognosticate nothing. I know Russian resistance will be maintained as long as Russia has the wherewithal to fight and that her resources of men and material are yet vast. But I know too that there can now be no spectacular Russian victory nor any speedy end to the war. I know that the greatest opportunity yet offered to the Allies has been missed and that it can never recur. If we examine the reasons why it was missed, let it be in no spirit of bitterness or indignation, however natural and justified, but calmly and patiently, that we may meet the new situation aright, that we may take better advantage of new opportunities yet to be offered in the changing fortunes of a war that even yet has hardly begun.

Now it is perfectly clear what was the best course for this country to pursue four months ago. There has never been any controversy about it: there can be none. The armchair strategists and the other kind—if there is any other kind—are in perfect agreement about it. Hitler had assembled an immensely strong force wherewith to attack Russia. He could do nothing else: he at least had no illusions about Russian weakness. He knew his own strength; he knew theirs. He has told us why he attacked Russia at all: it was because he dared not risk involving the bulk of his forces in a life-and-death struggle with this country knowing of a certainty that so soon as he did so he would be himself attacked in his rear by overwhelming Russian might. (His greater confidence in our Government than in Russia's appears not to have been misplaced.)

The British Ambassador to Turkey was at pains to inform the American press, from which it percolated ultimately to this country, that the British estimate was that of all German forces (except of course naval forces) approximately eighty per cent. were engaged in Russia in the earlier stages; the proportion must be much higher now. An attack in force anywhere in the West would have compelled the Nazis to fight on two fronts, the thing they attacked Russia to prevent; would have compelled them to weaken their forces in the East; at the best would have caught the whole of Germany in the most gigantic pincers in history and at the worst would have given the Russians just that measure of local superiority—they did not need much—which would have enabled them to maintain successful resistance everywhere, in readiness for greater opportunities as the unequal battle raged over the months until American material assistance became available in quantities that really mattered. Be it noted, first, that such an attack in the West did not need, for this purpose, to succeed locally: any more than the Russians needed to win the Battle of Tannenberg in order to save Paris, the Channel ports, and ultimately the war twenty-five years ago. Secondly, be it noted that Britain's declared object in this war is not a stalemate or a negotiated peace with Hitler but complete military victory: that such a victory cannot be achieved without an invasion of Europe: and that such an invasion in the West had a better chance of success while by far the greater portion of German forces were otherwise engaged in the East than if those forces were free. We dare not accept the ridiculous paradox that whereas the whole of the German forces with all Europe at their service cannot conquer these islands, yet these islands unassisted can conquer all Europe.

We did not take that course, It is infinitely harder to take it now. Why did we not take it? The answer appears to be threefold. Any one of the three reasons would have been sufficient. The three together were irresistible. All three must be removed if ever this war is to be won. And the time is short.

The first is that, after more than two years of war, nearly eighteen months after Dunkirk the state of our material equipment is such as to paralyse any offensive spirit. The authority for that statement is quite unexceptionable. The Secretary for War said so in a newspaper

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

article: the British Ambassador to America who is also a member of the inner War Cabinet publicly confirmed it in America. Now why is that? Not because the will is lacking. To doubt the determination of the present Government to win the war would be most foolishly to falsify the plain facts: to question the devoted efforts of the workers would be a libel which not even the most malicious enemy of labour has yet dared. But the Government which wills the end is not prepared to will the means. It armed itself with the most far reaching powers but its heart breaks and its hand shakes at each fumbling attempt to use them. Production could be secured by private enterprise: capitalism has never failed in the capacity to produce. But it cannot produce if its motive power is cut off. Its motive power, its necessary incentive, is profit. But the Government cannot allow it to make profit out of the most tragic war in history: the workers would stop working if they did. So the Excess Profit Duty confiscates the profit with a promise that something may be paid back after the war.

Production could be secured without private capitalism: the total organisation of total national economic capacity under public control directed solely by public needs. But that the Government will not do either: for how then are the old ways so dear to the Prime Minister to be preserved? Therefore the Government makes the worst of both worlds: They entrust the defence of humanity itself to private enterprise without the incentive which capitalist theory has always maintained to be an ineluctable necessity. The result they admit to be disastrous: we are without the means of victory at the moment of best hope of victory. The Government will have to realise that the economic motives and methods that have brought the world to disaster cannot save the world from disaster. They must choose between Defeat and Socialism.

The second is the defensive mind of the High Command. They have suffered so many defeats that they will not risk another. Their defeats have been due in the main to their stupid and obstinate refusal to understand the new methods of war. With every reason to know the truth, with full knowledge of the facts, as to tanks, parachutists, air-borne troops, dive bombers; with the advice before them of men like Fuller, Liddell Hart and others, they left the army—as the French left theirs—totally unprepared and unequipped to the onslaught of the German mechanised forces and the tactics consequent upon it. Instead of adapting themselves to the new facts, instead of turning the lessons of defeat into the inspiration of victory, they nurse their bruises behind a psychological Maginot Line, hoping that the inhibitions of an inferiority complex may be mistaken for a wise and cautious prudence. They will do nothing now without the certainty of success, believing apparently that the war can be won on the moneylenders' principle of "no advance without security." Defending the Government's policy in Greece, Attlee declared, "One of the lessons of this war is that there is no use thinking you can sit down behind defensive lines and wait to be attacked . . . We have not that Maginot Line mentality." That was better than his more recent view that we ought not to stage another spectacular failure in Europe merely in order to prove that we are trying to help Russia. We staged spectacular failures enough when there was little hope of spectacular victory: in Norway, in Belgium, in Greece, in Crete. Unless we can learn the lessons which Attlee himself drew from the Greek campaign, a spectacular failure in Russia largely occasioned by our fear of spectacular failures elsewhere, will but pave the way for the spectacular failure of civilisation itself.

The third reason is by far the most important. It is the political paralysis produced by the inhibitions and hesitations which flow from the failure of the democratic countries to understand the nature of the war. That failure found its most tragic exemplar (so far) in the fate of France; its most comic may be seen in the shufflings of the Foreign Office as to whether or not Russia was an ally or the wriggling of the Ministry of Information to avoid playing the Internationale. It is seen at perhaps its most fatuous in the continued ban on the *Daily Worker* or the Home Secretary's declaration from his privileged place in Parliament that all Communists are traitors. A necessary concomitant of any invasion of Europe must be an appeal to the workers in the occupied countries. But to what is that appeal to be made if not to the hope of a new world?

Fought as a struggle for the survival of the British Empire, *and for that alone*, everyone knows that this war could

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be won. We shall have to recognise, before it is won, that on the 3rd of September, two years ago, a way of life came to an end. The old order died. So far the new order has proved powerless to be born. That is the meaning of this war. For minds that will not recognise this, Russia's presence at our side is seen less as an aid in war than as an embarrassment in peace. I do not say, I do not believe, that Russia's defeat is desired. I do believe that too speedy, too spectacular a Russian victory would have created for those who still cling to the powers and privileges of an outworn society almost as many problems as it solved. But the absence of such a victory has produced problems not less awkward. A new order will indeed be born; the question now is, shall it be Hitler's slave Europe dominated by a slave Germany or a society of free men and free nations freely working together in a free Europe? Once more, we must choose between Defeat and Socialism.

For nearly two years a handful of Labour M.P.s have been endeavouring to persuade the Government to declare its war aims in this war. We made ourselves suspect; we were attacked, vilified, slandered, not only by the enemies of Socialism—we should have delighted in that—but by some of its reputed leaders. We made no apparent progress. We were told that this was no time to discuss theories about a new world; that to declare objects would produce such deep divisions in Government, Parliament and people as to impede the national effort, sacrifice its unity, and ensure defeat. In vain we pleaded that such a declaration was itself a most potent weapon of war; that we could not win without allies; that we could not hope for allies except for agreed, declared objects; all without avail. But it seems we were right after all. So right that at the most critical moment of the war, when the heroic resistance of the U.S.S.R. was holding up the might of Hitler's hitherto all-conquering armies, when an allied victory (theretofore most speculative) appeared ultimately certain, when the creation of an effective Western front would so have divided Hitler's forces as to bring him crashing in final catastrophe, when all the world and especially America was wondering whether and when we would do it and why on earth we did not; at that precise moment fraught with the ultimate destinies of all mankind, Churchill left his post to confer in mid-Atlantic about a declaration of peace aims, not with the allies who with us were shedding their blood and treasure without stint to defeat the common foe, but with Roosevelt struggling manfully, painfully, skilfully, courageously, but with limited success to awaken his peaceful and divided people to a sense of their responsibility to history. Russia has now subscribed to the joint declaration which they made. It now forms a binding statement of the common objects of a tripartite alliance to whose achievement America and Russia equally with ourselves are pledged: the foundations on which the economic mission to Moscow built its plans.

And what was the declaration? It asks "for all nations great and small, victor and vanquished, free access on equal terms to the raw materials of the world." It demands "the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field." It asks for "social security" and "assurance that all the men in all the lands shall live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

It demands in short a new world, a Socialist world. For the world has never yet enjoyed these things. The old world perished precisely for the want of them. If it had had them before, this terrible and devastating war could never have occurred. Why did we not have them? Unless Socialists have been talking nonsense for nearly a hundred years, it is because capitalist acquisitive society based on greed and exploitation cannot supply them. It is because our social, economic and political institutions are based upon the denial of them; because by denying them capitalism has produced of set purpose want in a world of plenty, fear when all want friendship, and war, the child of want and fear.

At last then we are committed to a new world. Let us free ourselves from our inhibitions. Let us declare to the hungry and oppressed of all Europe that we have chosen for ourselves and for them Socialism and not Defeat. Perhaps it is not too late.

But let us understand that that involves a call for social revolution all over Europe and that no Government will be able to make such a call—or be believed when it makes it—so long as it halts between two opinions or fears success as much as it dreads failure.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Production—Key to Victory

by ALLEN HUTT

"YOU in the factories have the task of saving the British people." An engineer speaks these simple words from the stage of the Stoll Theatre; he is a typical British engineer, alert and practical, vigorous and plainspoken, by name Walter Swanson, Shop Steward leader at the great Napier Works. He is talking to 1,237 odd delegates from some 300 factories, works and yards in the key war industries—representing 500,000 builders and repairers of ships, makers of tanks and planes and guns and shells.* The occasion is the national conference on production convened by the Engineering and Allied Trades Shop Stewards National Council and their organ the *New Propellor*. And the whole issue is summed up in those simple words from Brother Swanson.

That being the task, its achievement will naturally not be as simple as its enunciation. But it was precisely to consider the detailed policy needed for this achievement that the conference of Octobr 19 had been summoned, carrying forward nationally the movement launched by the Shop Stewards Council at their all-London production conference on August 23. Certainly if the effect of this latest and greatest Shop Stewards gathering upon its participants was anything like the effect upon myself, then the throttle is wide open and the movement will race ahead. It is no accident that the conference had the most remarkable press of any working-class assembly in recent years, with page leads or main stories in every national paper, not excluding the singular *cachet* of a lengthy and sympathetic leader in *The Times*. I think there can be no question that this was due to the conference's outstanding characteristic, its *positive* note. This was the more marked since the arms Shop Stewards have up to now been largely concerned with the necessary but *negative* task of exposing in detail and making familiar to everyone the wretched story of waste, mismanagement, inefficiency and lagging output in the war industries. Not that the constructive line has been lacking hitherto: the point is that now it predominates: and there indeed is a step forward of incalculable significance.

The positive note was struck at the very beginning in Walter Swanson's opening statement on behalf of the Council.

> We have now reached a position (he said) where every one of us has to approach the problem of production from a new angle, and we believe we will get the best results from our conference, not merely by discussing the waste, mismanagement and inefficiency of present methods of control and direction of production, but what we can and will do to increase production from our side, and in doing so help to effect changes which will go right through industry even to the top . . . Can we wait until the Government and the employers are brought to their senses before we ourselves begin to set the example to show what we can do on our side to turn out munitions? We cannot: and a glance at the map of Europe showing where Hitler has got to will prove we cannot—if we really mean to win.

Consider what that means. Concretely, on the job, it involves sensational changes in traditional methods. Swanson indicated some of these—"greater readiness to promote the changeability of labour, pooling of tools, skill and practical knowledge," "most effective training of all unskilled men and women, and removal of barriers to trade progress," mutual help on difficult jobs "so that the whole shop is working like a collective team," different trades to agree on prevention of demarcation rules restricting output "when we are fighting for our very lives against Fascism," skilled workers to lead in devising new methods of work as jobs are broken up into series of lesser skilled operations, every worker to know his firm's production plan and output aim so that by

* Half the delegates came from 107 factories in the London area and half from 193 factories in the rest of the country. Amongst the latter were delegates of 41 from the Midlands, 25 from the Home Counties, 21 from the West Country, and 40 from Lancashire and Merseyside.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"co-operation and competition . . . as between shop and shop, factory and factory" achievement can be speeded. Enough, surely, to make the founding fathers of the old A.S.E. turn in their graves; but something that Frederick Engels would have understood and approved—did he not urge the craft unions over fifty years ago to scrap the "old lumber" of their even then outworn craft prejudices and exclusiveness, as the only way to become powerful fighting organisations of all the workers in their trades?

That last point is important. An accompaniment and a condition of this revolutionary production drive, Swanson made plain, must be constant recruitment to, and steady strengthening of, the unions, with the most effective functioning of their branches and district committees. More than in 1914-1918 the shop stewards to-day stand for the fortifying of the unions, and they desire to secure union endorsement; which makes the hostility of Union officialdom, typified in the A.E.U.'s ban on this very conference, quite remarkably crazy (as it is, in these grave days, quite remarkably monstrous).

One other essential condition Swanson underlined at the outset. Urging all workers to "set the highest example in the quality, quantity and rapidity with which they turn out the job," he stressed that agreement should be secured for the preservation of piecework prices and bonus rates. He further emphasised the urgency of ironing out wage anomalies, levelling up low rates, and improving canteen and transport facilities.

But the big thing about this "entirely new approach to the problems of production" lay in the fact that it did not, as does official propaganda, abstract the problem of production from the whole problem of total war. Indeed, Swanson's statement was a far more penetrating and realistic analysis of how total war needs to be appreciated than the utterances of almost any Cabinet Minister. There was no trace here of the conventional view that, so long as production is pushed up to phenomenal heights, then in some apocalyptic way the instruments of war thus massed will be somehow employed (probably by somebody else) to defeat Hitler. Swanson said bluntly, "The deeply ingrained belief that our part is to supply the munitions while some other country will supply the fighting men has to be completely destroyed if we are to win."

From this standpoint Swanson turned to give the conference a striking lead on the vital matter of manpower. He rebutted the view that men on munitions could not, or should not, be considered as potential soldiers. "A mechanical army needs mechanics." Therefore, he went on, "we have now to really help women workers to take our places in the factories so that we can also strengthen the armed forces . . . It is of the utmost political and military importance that we now accept our own direct responsibility for teaching women how to do the most skilled jobs and drop all our prejudices and fear about the introduction and training of women for industry." Simultaneously he stressed the importance of training women in Trade Union organisation and in securing equitable conditions and amenities.

Swanson, I repeat, was outlining a production policy as an integral part of a whole programme of total war. Production is a key to victory; not a single, isolated and exclusive key, though an absolutely essential one. It was, therefore, only natural and proper that Swanson related production to the central issue of Russia and the second front. The problem of production, he emphasised, had to be faced in the decisively new way he had indicated "because we had reached a position in the war where, owing to Britain's shameful reluctance to take its full share of working and fighting alongside the Russians, our own position is one of exceptional gravity." And it should be recorded that the loudest applause of the conference greeted this passage:

> We are sure that we all feel and share the great and justifiable alarm felt by the workers in every factory that the Government is not pulling its weight alongside Russia. It needs to be publicly stated that the factories are seething with suspicion, that "the Government is letting Russia down," or that "the presence of the Halifaxes, Moore-Brabazons and Margessons is the reason why there is no Second Front." We warn the Government, the workers will never allow them to let Russia down, for they know it means that we go down as well. The workers demand that Britain puts as much in the kitty as the Russians, and that is why they insist on the immediate opening of a Second Front.

"Work and fight." The emphasis is on both. "The British workers in industry and the armed forces, acting as a single unit with a single aim—the smashing of Hitler." The fact is inescapable: "Every able-bodied man

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and woman in the country has got to be organised for war service, in the forces, in industry or in civil defence." And all those in the front line must have the first consideration—"there has got to be a more equitable distribution of sacrifice." So far as *work* is concerned the central proposal of Swanson was summed up in the sentence, "formation of Joint Production Committees in every factory with the fullest facilities for the Shop Stewards taking full part and accepting joint responsibility for seeing that plans are discussed with all the workers and then carried out."

Given this lead, what of the conference itself? To say that the lead was enthusiastically endorsed was, certainly, the big thing. And in the formal resolution so doing the delegates agreed to report the conference debates and decisions to mass meetings as quickly as possible and mandated the Council to carry through a nationwide campaign on the issues. At the same time it was decided to broadcast a printed report of the conference including a memorandum by the Council which (after amplification on the basis of material submitted in the Conference) is to be submitted to the Select Committee on National Expenditure: a summary of the points to be included in this document was laid before the conference and is printed textually as an appendix to this article.*

Endorsement was, however, the more striking because of the impressive quality of the representation at the conference. Here was a real cross-section of the millions-strong army of Britain's war industry. Responsible delegates were here speaking in the name of the workers at great munition plants of all kinds operated by firms whose names are household words. The announcements of the various speakers' works and factories read like a roll-call of the giants of British industry—Vickers-Armstrong, English Steel, John Brown's, Humber-Hillman, Fairfields, Cammell Laird, Thorneycrofts, Harland & Wolff, Metropolitan-Vickers, Bristol and Gloucester Aircraft, de Havillands, Napiers.

That such a gathering should enthuse over this new lead on production is, it will be agreed, something of wide significance. Nor could there be any mistaking the fierce determination of the conference to make the Anglo-Soviet Alliance a fighting reality. The thunder of applause which greeted Swanson's references to Russia and the Second Front, quoted above, was echoed at every similar reference made by speakers in the discussion. It was with acclamation that the conference resolved to send, through the Soviet Embassy, its fraternal greetings to the people of the U.S.S.R., adding "our admiration of your tremendous heroism and fierce fight against Hitler Fascism is not enough, and we pledge ourselves to continue our efforts to increase production and take every measure that will guarantee quickly our joint victory over Fascism." Equally clear and strong were the "ayes" which endorsed the proposal by the Napier delegation to send a message to Mr. Churchill demanding "the opening up of a Western Front against Hitler as quickly as possible. We pledge ourselves to continue our efforts to increase production to a degree that will guarantee the maintenance of such a front and material aid to our ally, the U.S.S.R."

While we are referring to the conference's enthusiasm on these two main issues, it is necessary to recall that there was one other issue on which it repeatedly, by its instant and prolonged cheering, made clear the depth of its sentiments. That is the question of the *Daily Worker*. The extent of feeling throughout the working class movement of Britain on this matter has long been well known. But it was interesting to observe, first, how many speakers at the conference said plainly that they and their fellows wanted the *Daily Worker* back and wanted it back right away, and second how each and every reference of this kind touched off an explosion of applause. It was with unanimous acclaim that the conference passed a resolution, proposed by one large aircraft works, in which it "endorses the decisions of the twenty-six Trade Unions who have demanded the lifting of the ban on the *Daily Worker*. We believe that this paper can help us a lot in carrying through the policy of this conference for increased production."

The general tone of the discussion at the conference was in line with the positive note struck by Swanson. Example after example came from delegates showing how the new approach to the problems of production, the beginnings of consultation and joint effort with the management along the lines suggested was able to produce already quite remarkable, even sensational, results.

Here, for instance, was a Sheffield delegate who told how during the last

* On page 466 under DOCUMENTS OF THE MONTH.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fortnight certain simplifications in process in a famous gun shop had increased output by 10 per cent. This experience had made him appreciate the value of a joint production committee with a drawing together of such bodies in an area, co-ordinated with the Union District Organisers and thus reaching out to strengthen the work of the Regional Production Boards. A Clydebank delegate told how the employment of unskilled labour in preparatory work for riveters could raise output by 30 per cent. to 50 per cent.

One Glasgow delegate recounted some production triumphs that sounded like the reports of the beginnings of the Stakhanov movement which used, one remembers, to puzzle some people here. In one boiler shop, he said, the workers suggested certain alterations in the production process and in consequence output rose from 85 units to 200 units a month. In the same way production of a particular gun part trebled. In yet another shop changes on a job put forward by the men on the job resulted in the reduction from 40 to 12 hours of the official Ministry of Supply schedule for completion. In the case of a special order for ten vital pieces of equipment for the U.S.S.R. production was completed in two days as against the normal seven for the particular job; the men responded, apart from the ever-present urge to go all out on a Russian order, because they secured an assurance that their exceptional effort would not lead to rate-cutting.*

Perhaps the most revealing example of all was that given by a delegate from an arms works in the Greater London area. He described how the experts of his firm's planning department had designed 22 different jigs for a certain large order that was about to go into mass production. While these plans were being prepared the jig-makers, as is so often the case, were waiting idly by with no work to do. They got a notion of what was in train, however, and one jig-maker, without the knowledge of the management, occupied his waiting time by seeing if he could not go one better than the high-powered experts. Actually he went 21 better: for he devised a single jig which supplanted the whole 22 designed from on high.

Facts like these talk a language that cannot be gainsaid. Cases are multiplying where managements appreciate and openly express their gratitude to the Shop Stewards for their initiative and enterprise in leading the men to raise output. Thus the head of one important department in a noted works issued the following notice:

> I am very pleased with the increase in production in my department since the production drive by the workpeople . . . jobs are being done nearly twice as quick. One job which originally took 109 hours to do is now being done in 47 hours by the same labour staff. Workers, shop stewards, chargehands and myself are now driving for a total war effort.

In this general picture there were inevitably shadows as well as highlights; but none that could not be tackled given genuine co-operation. The women delegates, whose participation in the conference was a feature, noted how women were in fact able to do some jobs faster than men, and had therefore been taken off and men put back (Coventry), while the persistence of what she neatly called the men's "ostrich" quality of ignoring the women was scored by a Manchester woman delegate who gave an example of a woman who had been working in her factory for 32 years and had never been asked to join the Union. There was also, it has to be said, a certain confusion—very understandable—in some minds. Few Shop Stewards of the last war, said one veteran, would ever have thought that they might be playing an enthusiastic part in a conference whose main aim was to secure increased production along the lines discussed. And one noted phrases and notions in some speeches (which won a measure of applause) showing how old ideas are clung to even though they have become shibboleths. I have in mind references to workers' control, control of labour supply by the Unions, to the suggestion that total war could only be waged when capitalism had been swept away.

In his final reply for the Council Swanson noted these last points and stressed that these confusions could only continue to the extent that there was a failure to appreciate the full seriousness of the situation. We could not, he said, continue in the old way, though, of course, there were certain employers (and workers) who still thought they were

* Here may be noted the universal feeling that the biggest single obstacle to maximum effort was the danger of rate-cutting by managements.' In addition in the shipyards there is bitter objection on the part of craftsmen and labourers to the low wages which in some cases are £1 a week less than that paid to the same grades outside the yards.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

living in the good old days. Old phrases, no matter how revolutionary, would not save us and the U.S.S.R.; and, speaking as a lifelong Socialist, he had to emphasise that our only chance of Socialism in the future was bound up with victory for ourselves and the Soviet Union. The plain fact, he continued, was that increasing the production of every type of weapon really ensured the future of the British people. Even though there was so much leeway to make up the workers were already showing how they could use their organised strength to wipe out capitalist blunders and redundancies.

The Shop Stewards had the task, Swanson concluded, of making the workers understand the gigantic nature of the job before them. There was need for constant explanation, the awakening of real political conviction and the breaking of the apathy that still prevailed among some sections. On their return the delegates from the conference should get around to nearby factories not yet linked with the Shop Stewards' Council. No pains should be spared to secure the greatest mobilisation of labour that this country had ever seen; and if the drive for Joint Production Committees were really pressed the Government could be compelled to act against the rump of employers who might refuse to co-operate.

I have said that this conference had a most inspiring effect upon me. I have had twenty years of conferences and I went to this one tired and jaded, straight from an exhausting night's work in the glare and strain of my newspaper office; but I had not sat long in that crowded Kingsway theatre before I felt vastly refreshed. The pulse of this conference was steady and strong. It showed that the indispensable N.C.O.'s of Britain's industrial army were rallying to a new and mighty task with a freshness and a determination that bodes ill, both for the Fascist barbarians and the fainthearts. Long ago Engels said that the insular and stiffnecked British people were maddeningly difficult to rouse, but their very obstinacy guaranteed that once roused "what is begun will be carried out." I thought of those words as I watched the conference on October 19th, as I listened to the forthright speakers talking plain commonsense to the serried crowd that filled the auditorium of the sombre Edwardian opera house. I have the absolute conviction that this time they will be proved true as never before.

Stalin as the Leader of the U.S.S.R.

by VYACHESLAV MOLOTOV

At this moment the following speech by the present Commissary for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. is of particular interest. The portion printed is taken from the second part of the speech, which was delivered in 1939, the year of Stalin's sixtieth birthday.

AS the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin is at the same time also the leader of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is quite natural, for to our Party belongs the leading role in the Soviet State, which is realising the dictatorship of the working class on the basis of an alliance with the working peasantry.

The role of Comrade Stalin as the leader of the U.S.S.R. deserves special attention. This is particularly so because, as distinct from the Party, which is a voluntary organisation of the vanguard of the working people and hence, as Lenin expressed it, "the Party is the highest form of class association of the proletarians," the State of the dictatorship of the working class is an organisation that embraces the entire population with the class distinctions that still exist in it, and with the obligatory subordination of all the citizens of the country to the will of State authority which, with the working class at the helm of power, represents the interests and will of the majority of the people. This shows, firstly, how important and decisive is the guidance of the State

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organisation by the Party and, secondly, the need for special forms of this guidance in conformity with the period and the very nature of the different sphere of State activity. By administering a crushing theoretical rebuff to the Trotskyite-Zinovyevite-Bukharinite falsification of Leninism, according to which the dictatorship of the working class was vulgarly identified with the "dictatorship of the Party," Comrade Stalin gave a classically Marxist elaboration of the question of the Party and the working class in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At this point it is necessary to make a special mention of the famous article, *Problems of Leninism.*

Nevertheless, even everything written by Comrade Stalin is only a small part of what he has done for the Party and for the working people in talks, meetings and conferences for the ideological elucidation of the fundamental question of the Revolution, the question of the tasks of the Socialist State. To this must be added that his participation in all State affairs—not always outwardly visible but actually most active—is to be felt in everything and at each step.

The exceptional role of Comrade Stalin in the very formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is well known.

Comrade Stalin worked more than anybody else on the transformation of the insufficiently united Soviet Republics into the Soviet Union, which is strong in its political unity, and worked on the drafting of its first Constitution. In this way was laid the foundation of the mighty Soviet State, based upon the great friendship of the Soviet peoples.

The present Constitution of the U.S.S.R. has been given the name of the "Stalin Constitution" by the people. This not only signifies the name of the author of its draft, but also emphasises the banner under which the Soviet Union has come to those great victories which are recorded in our Constitution. This Constitution has secured the broad democratic rights of the nationalities forming part of the multi-national Soviet Union and, at the same time, consolidated the U.S.S.R. as a single Socialist State that is the prototype of the fraternal collaboration of the peoples of the whole world.

It was also no accident that Comrade Stalin became People's Commissary of Nationalities after the victory of the October Revolution. It was no easy matter to establish collaboration and, consequently, trust between the peoples, among whom the Russians had formed the dominant nation for centuries, while all other nationalities had been in a state of oppression or simply in the position of colonies. Comrade Stalin brilliantly coped with his task; he coped with it by unswerving struggle against the survivals of imperialist chauvinism and by persistent work among the representatives of the nationalities that had been oppressed in old Russia, for fostering confidence and friendly relations among all the peoples of the U.S.S.R.

This became possible because Comrade Stalin proceeded along the Leninist path also in this matter, the solution of the national question. Long before the Revolution he had theoretically worked out, side by side with Lenin, the fundamental principles of the national question from the point of view of Marxism. His pamphlet, *Marxism and the National Question (1913),* rightly belongs to the basic works on Marxist theory. It may be seen from this work that its author had already at that time developed into a most outstanding theoretician of Marxism. It is clear, therefore, why our policy on the national question has long been known as the "Leninist-Stalinist national policy."

After this it is clear why not only the Party, but also the peoples of our entire country, see in Comrade Stalin their leader, the leader of the U.S.S.R.

Under the guidance of Lenin, Comrade Stalin was the chief organiser of the October uprising, which laid the foundation for the power of the Soviets. After the victory of the October Revolution, Comrade Stalin was the main builder of the Red Army, which under his direct leadership defended on the main fronts of the Civil War the existence of the Soviet State against the intervention of the imperialist powers. During all these years, he has been the man who has inspired the entire work of strengthening the might of the Red Army as the decisive guarantee of the State independence of the U.S.S.R. Thanks to this our State has been completely consolidated and no encroachments from without can daunt it.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the Party has already built in the main the Socialist society, which Lenin, the founder of the U.S.S.R., was not as yet able to realise. A steadily growing industry, equipped with a wealth of up-to-date technique, has been created;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cadres of people that have mastered technique have grown, people of whom there were so few in the past and who now, in the person of the Stakhanovites and the followers of the Stakhanovite movement, constitute a tremendous force and display ever new marvels of conscious social labour. The countryside with its former ocean of petty farms has been reconstructed along new lines—the collective farm system has been created with its tremendous possibilities and the path has been laid for a mighty advance of all branches of agriculture. The material and cultural conditions of the life of the workers, the peasants, and broad sections of the intelligentsia have been radically improved. The culture of the peoples, science, literature and art, freed from material fetters and disgusting subservience to the rich, have for the first time in world history received the possibility to devote their creative efforts to the service of the people in full measure, to the service of the flourishing of their free, happy life.

Who does not know what an inspiring and organising role has been played in all this by the "Stalinist five-year plans" and by the personal initiative of Comrade Stalin both in the greatest affairs of economic and cultural development, as well as in the "current" everyday matters and cares of improving the work of our organisations, right down to the very smallest. Bound up with the initiative and most active participation of Comrade Stalin is everything more or less essential that has been or is being built during these years by the Party and the Government in the U.S.S.R., in the first Land of Socialism.

Comrade Stalin has done exceptionally much in the work of establishing and developing the U.S.S.R. as a multi-national State with its flourishing national cultures, a State strong by virtue of the fraternal collaboration and friendship of the peoples. The mere fact of the existence of such a State as the Soviet Union, which is steadily growing economically, culturally and politically—this mere fact predetermines the fleeting destiny of the capitalist world with its policy of fanning national enmity and unbearable colonial oppression for many peoples, with its criminal imperialist wars, which rack the peoples for the sake of the self-seeking interests of the ruling circles of the bourgeoisie.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, we have victoriously routed the enemies of the people, we have purged and will continue to purge the State apparatus from inimical, spying and wrecking elements. It is known that this kind of measure greatly improves the work of our organs, paves the way for promoting fresh, honest and conscious cadres of workers, strengthens our State. Bolshevik vigilance with regard to the enemies, pursued not in words but in deed, is considered by us as the best index of the fighting capacity and maturity of our forces, of our Party and State.

Bound up with the initiative and guiding participation of Comrade Stalin are also all our decisions in the sphere of home and foreign policy, which have guaranteed the peoples of the Soviet Union tranquillity, lasting peace and the international prestige of the U.S.S.R.

A remarkable bond has been established in the Soviet Union between the Communists and the "non-Party Bolsheviks," whose number is growing rapidly both among the workers and the peasants as well as among the intelligentsia. This is one of the greatest successes of our Party in recent years.

A great rapprochement has also taken place among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. Notwithstanding all the difference in their historical development and in their customs of life, the victory of Socialism and the establishment in the U.S.S.R. of the foundations of Socialist society, which is liberated from the age-old exploitation of man by man and gives a proper combination of the interests of the peoples in the matter of their common economic and cultural development, ensures fraternal accord between the Soviet peoples, an accord that is growing before the eyes of all, and ensures unlimited possibilities for further successes of the U.S.S.R.'

The moral and political unity of our society, in which each people is free to mould its own life and all the peoples are helping one another in the steadfast advance to a happy life of the peoples of the U.S.S.R.—such is the glorious result of the growth and transformation of our country under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin. The leader and banner of this unity of the peoples, the leader of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., as is known by the toiling people throughout the world, is the great continuer of the cause of Lenin, our Stalin, around whom our Party, the Soviet peoples, and all that is best in the world movement for emancipation are rallied.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

World Scientists against Fascism

by THALES

SCIENCE has been very much in the news recently. People all over the world have heard by radio, in the Press, and by news-reels, of the recent International Conference of scientists in London organised by the British Association, and of the anti-Fascist radio meeting of scientists in Moscow organised by the Soviet Academy of Sciences. It is most significant that such Conferences have been arranged only in the capitals of the two Allied countries actively engaged in the struggle against German and Italian Fascism, and at a time of the greatest seriousness in the war. Chinese and American men of science flew by Clipper to the London Conference; Soviet scientists, finding it impracticable to attend in person, broadcast speeches to the Conference which were to be recorded in London and played over to the audience. The Nazis found it advisable to jam the transmissions. Cabled messages, however, came through Representatives of most of the European countries now occupied by Hitler attended the Conference and contributed to the discussions. The Moscow radio meeting received messages from eminent men of science all over the world, and, in particular, from British scientists and scientific bodies. This unwonted hubbub in the scientific world shows that there is the beginning of understanding by scientists of the important role they have in the war, and in the planning of the peace. There exists a widespread desire to unite their scientific and technical forces internationally to these ends.

The British Association for the Advancement of Science was founded in 1831 with the general liberal aims of ensuring the advancement of scientific ideas for the benefit of humanity and of providing a meeting ground for all categories of scientists. The international aspect of science was stressed. The big British Association meetings have always been fairly fully reported in the Press, and it is as well to recall some of the more historic meetings. It was at a Meeting in Oxford that T. H. Huxley defended Darwinism with such vigour against the obscurantism of the Church in the last century.

But on the whole, until fairly recently, there existed among British scientists an incomplete appreciation of the revolutionary role of scientific achievement in modern society. The Industrial Revolution was only made possible by the application of scientific knowledge to technological advance. Even more so to-day does the continuance, not to mention the development, of large-scale factory production, of large-scale agricultural practice, of public heath precautions, depend on the work of scientists. But in the U.S.S.R. the close relationship between scientific research and a technological society has always been explicitly recognised. As is well known, in the Soviet Union great care is taken both to plan production and to plan scientific research in relation to production.

Soviet historians traced the close connection between the general direction of scientific advance and the economic conditions of the time. A change in the attitude of British scientists became manifest as a result of the contributions made by the Soviet delegation to the International Congress on the Methodology of Science held in London in 1931. From that time a new approach to their work was slowly gained by scientists. The writings of Bernal, Haldane, Crowther, Hogben, Levy and Huxley, stressing the relation between science and society, were read very widely, and particularly by the younger generation of scientists. The Association of Scientific Workers, at that time a moribund organisation dating from the late years of the last war, was resuscitated. Recently, scientists, impelled like every other class of worker to organise, have seen the necessity of a trade union, and the Association of Scientific Workers is filling the need in an enlightened way. It is now a healthy, rapidly growing body, influential both in protecting its members and in ensuring the better utilisation of scientific knowledge in the war effort. For now, at least, scientists are seeing the necessity for planned action. This war makes great calls upon science, and needs to be conducted scientifically.

At the Cambridge meeting of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Association held in August, 1938, a Division was set up to deal with the Social and International Relations of Science. This was a direct outcome of the new spirit of social responsibility which many scientists were feeling and which had been given expression by the above writers among others. Yet this new Division, formed with aims to which all progressive scientists could subscribe, accomplished very little—due in large measure to the poor support given it by progressive rank-and-file scientists. But now by organising the recent International Conference, this Division of the British Association has been responsible for a renewed wave of enthusiasm among scientists and for a somewhat more receptive attitude on the part of some Ministers. On its committee are many active and progressive men of science including vice-presidents and members of the Association of Scientific Workers. It can do valuable work, but only if supported by scientists all over the country. It is essential that all progressive scientists actively undertake to use the possibilities now created. In this respect, close collaboration should exist between the Association of Scientific Workers and the British Association, and it is encouraging to note that both bodies are willing to develop this. The Association of Scientific Workers being a trade union with a representative membership of working scientists can undertake activity and collect first-hand information of a type which the British Association would find it difficult to do. On the other hand, as a link between the ordinary scientist and those in authority, the British Association can act on a different level from the Association of Scientific Workers.

There is another pointer: the Marx House Faculty of Science has held two large conferences, the attendance at which surprised even the organisers. Many hundreds of working scientists, many of them of international repute, together with members of the general public, discussed the role of science in the present situation, and the necessity for a dialectical approach to scientific problems.

In the Soviet Union, of course, the development of science was spectacular. Whereas in Great Britain there has been a tradition of scientific research of high quality for hundreds of years, in Tsarist Russia scientific attainment was generally at a low level. The Revolution had to start more or less from scratch to train scientists and technicians, to build laboratories and to create its scientific culture. That is not to say that the Old Russia had not given many great names to science—such as the towering figures of Lomonosov, Mendeleeff and Pavlov.

But a country cannot rely scientifically on the isolated work of a few individuals and their pupils. The Russian Academy of Sciences did not concern itself with technological problems, there was little large-scale industry, and the repressive hand of the Tsar was felt in science as much as in any other field of constructive endeavour. The Soviet Government, on the other hand, has encouraged in every way the development of science. Large numbers of well-equipped institutions have been built. The Academy of Sciences under Soviet power bears no comparison with its earlier days. Scientific results are applied in industry and agriculture more quickly than in any other country. Science in a Socialist country forged ahead, gaining the respect of progressive scientists all over the world.

This progress in the Soviet Union, and in Great Britain and the U.S.A., should be compared with the state of affairs in Nazi Germany. Germany used to be one of the greatest scientific countries in the world. To what depths has German science now sunk! It is the handmaiden of falsehood, force and oppression. It provides the means whereby Hitler carries out his conquests. German science can go on in this way for many years in spite of its isolation and degeneration. All the more reson then for the free scientists of the world to unite their forces to ensure victory over Fascism.

The British Association Conference should be viewed as a starting ground for this international co-operation. Simply viewed as a Conference it was a very mixed affair. First its wider significance should be examined. It was an international conference of free scientists meeting with a political aim in view, that of organising science to win the war and plan the peace. Only very few of the speakers were of the Left in politics, and many of the speakers were men who have been vocal in the past against even the planning of science. That such men have advanced to advocating the planning of science to a social end is most significant. It is not, of course, nearly enough. Far too many

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not the rule. In land-ownership, in employment, in taxation, in education, in the provision of social and public services, in civil and political rights—in all these points the story never varies. In all of them the law and the officials treat the Africans as sub-human, the white immigrants as *Herrenvolk*.

This all-pervasive spread of the colour-bar undoubtedly represents a great degeneration in the standards of British Governments. A century ago, as Dr. Leys reminds us, the New Zealand Company wanted to tear up a treaty which guaranteed the Maori their remaining lands. The company, with even more candour than is shown to-day by white settlers in their relations with Africans, urged that the treaty had been made with "naked savages" and that it was "merely a praiseworthy device for amusing and pacifying them for the moment." The British Government's reply ran thus:

> "Lord Stanley entertains a different view of the respect due to an obligation contracted by the Crown of England, and his final answer to the demands of the Company must be that he will not admit that any person or Government can contract a legal, moral or honorary obligation to despoil others of their lawful and equitable rights."

It is certainly impossible to imagine any British Secretary of State or Colonial Governor addressing European vested interests in Africa in terms of such forthright honesty to-day.

In narrating and describing all these matters Dr. Leys writes with assured mastery and telling effect. So he does too when arguing the case for a genuine equal rights policy, when insisting that Africans are in fact the equals of white men in their natures and capacities, and when declaring that the master-servant relation alone blinds people to that fact. "The very air in South and East Africa is so charged with the passionate conviction that black must serve white eternally that it is only when one gets clear of it that one can face the facts objectively." It is when Dr. Leys seeks to explain these things and to find remedies for present discontents that he seems to sink below the level of his theme. Then he relies on the simplest of schemes. He wants the British Parliament to make a solemn re-affirmation of the equal rights principle, and the Colonial Office to send out a circular despatch to all Colonial Governors telling them how to carry it into effect. This, he admits, would make the settlers very angry, but it would release "a fountain of gratitude and loyalty in multitudes of people of African descent."

From a Marxist standpoint all this is poor, topsy-turvy kind of stuff, almost fantastic in the light-heartedness with which it ignores the main social forces involved. But Dr. Leys is not a Marxist, and it is idle to comment on his work as though he were or ought to be. No doubt he ought; but the relevant point is that he is not. Yet even on his own ground such a programme seems insufficient. There are, he says, no colour bars in India, and none in French, Belgian, or Portuguese Africa. This statement, though correct enough in a narrow legalistic sense, is highly misleading. But even if it were wholly true and adequate, what then? Would Dr. Leys argue that the degree of effective exploitation of indigenous peoples is less in India and in French, Belgian and Portuguese Africa than in British Africa? It would be an uncomfortable position to defend. But if it is not defended, there is an end of the view that exploitation can be disposed of by a mere frontal attack on the colour-bar, unaccompanied by any other measures.

LEONARD BARNES.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Let's Try Reality. W. Rowland Jones. (Allen & Unwin.) 3*s*. 6*d*. 168 pp.
I Saw Poland Suffer. A Polish Doctor. (Lindsay Drummond.) 5*s*. 126 pp.
Class Struggles in South Africa. W. H. Andrews. (Author.) 1*s*. 64 pp.
Country With a Plan. Pat Sloan. (Key Books.) 4*d*. 72 pp.
China's New Crisis. Anna Louise Strong. (Key Books.) 4*d*. 62 pp.
The Hawkspur Experiment. W. David Wills. (Allen & Unwin.) 6*s*. 192 pp.
The Assistance Board. Joan Simeon Clarke. (Fabian Society.) 6*d*. 28 pp.
A Short History of Science. Charles Singer. (Oxford Clarendon Press.) 8*s*. 6*d*. 299 pp.
The U.S.S.R. Our Ally. D. N. Pritt. (Frederick Muller, Ltd.) 1*s*. 64 pp.
The Politics of Victory. Tom Wintringham. (George Routledge & Sons.) 5*s*. 139 pp.
Happy Marriage. Dr. Norman Hines. (Allen & Unwin, Ltd) 12*s*. 6*d*. 368 pp.
Civil Liberties Defended. National Council for Civil Liberties. 3*d*. 19 pp.
A.B.C. of Invasion Law. Robert S. W. Polland. (John Cranther, Ltd.) 1*s*. 71 pp.
Why is Germany Aggressive. The Socialist Clarity Group. (N.C.L.C.) 3*d*. 16 pp.
Why Wait for the Blitz. A.A.S.T.A. 6*d*. 24 pp.
The Fall of the French Republic. D. N. Pritt. (Frederick Muller, Ld.) 5*s*. 177 pp.
U.S.S.R. Speaks For Itself. *Vol*. 1, *Industry*. *Volume* 4, *Culture and Leisure*. (Lawrence & Wishart). 2*s*. 6*d*. each. 96 pp.
Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation. Beatrice and Sidney Webb. Third Edition with a new preface. (Longmans Green.) 21*s*. 1,257 pp.
Co-operative Politics Inside Capitalist Society. Fred Longden. (Cornish Brothers, Ltd.) 8*s*. 6*d*. 252 pp.

of the speakers indulged in wishful thinking, far too many were concerned with elaborating detailed plans for the post-war world without considering sufficiently the present urgent tasks of science. But many, too, stressed the necessity for immediate action. Mr. Mitskevitch struck a realist note in his opening address. He said that the immediate and urgent task of scientists is to help overthrow Hitler. Without that, all talk of a new world is so much waste of time, and we have little time to waste. It was clear that this desire was present in an incoherent form throughout the meetings. It is the job of scientists in this country, in close collaboration with the scientists of the U.S.S.R. and of the U.S.A., to lend it substance.

One unpleasant note in the Conference was the exclusion by implication of the U.S.S.R. in post-war planning by some speakers. They formed a sort of Anglo-American bloc. They kept turning to the U.S.A. when referring to co-operation and planning. This is a tendency which we must combat. On the other hand, many speakers dealt in some detail with the sort of problem which the U.S.S.R. will have to face on the conclusion of hostilities, and the responsibility of all scientists to help their Soviet colleagues. The ravages of war, coupled with the "scorched earth" policy, both in Russia and China, will mean that there will be need for help on an international scale. Sir John Russell, the distinguished British agricultural scientist, who has first-hand experience of the achievements of Soviet collectivised agriculture, came forward with practical suggestions. The outstanding achievements of Soviet agricultural scientists, particularly in breeding special strains of wheat, must be preserved, and it is the duty of scientists of all countries to help in this. Sir John Orr's realism was also welcome. He was considering the problems of food supply on a world scale, and did not, as so many people do, simply ignore the millions of underfed colonial peoples. J. B. S. Haldane's trenchant exposition of the achievements of Soviet science struck a new and stimulating note.

The British Association has set up Committees to deal with some of the problems raised at the Conference, in particular, those of nutrition and allied topics. But a lot remains to be done. Mr. Swann, of the Association of Scientific Workers, gave instances of the inadequate application of science in the war effort. It is from the scientific workers actually engaged on war production in the factories that the most useful suggestions will come. They are getting together with this aim in view. The Association of Scientific Workers is organising a National Conference in January to deal with urgent scientific and technical problems raised by the war. It is the grave responsibility of scientists in industry to set the pace. They must, together with the Shop Stewards and other workers, expose inefficiency and the operation of vested interests inimical to production. The situation now is critical and drastic measures may have to be taken. Scientists may point the way, but the realisation of their technical advice is a political task.

It is an absolute essential that there shall be the closest technical collaboration between this country and the U.S.S.R. At the moment this is not the case. There is, on the other hand, close contact with the U.S.A. on these matters. It is fantastic that after four months of intense fighting we should not have exchanged technical and scientific delegations with our only belligerent ally. We must pool information and ideas. Messages of good will and friendship are all very well, but British and American scientists can aid and be aided by their Soviet colleagues in more useful ways. An international technical commission on these lines and with this aim would be of the greatest use. The Soviet scientists have appealed recently to the scientists of the world for aid in their struggle. Let us see to it that this appeal is answered concretely. The desire is there. The organisation must be specially created to see that the co-ordination of our joint scientific brain power is made effective.

If we can create such co-operation and win the war, the prospects of science in a planned post-war economy are truly enormous. Scientists after the war will have an extremely important job to do. Immediately after the war, there will be colossal suffering through famine, disease and the widespread destruction of capital equipment. Only on an international scale can these problems be tackled. This will require the pooled skill and direction of scientists of all countries. We can lay the foundation now for solving these problems. Men of science will be ready to serve. We must all see to it that they are given their opportunity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Resolutions adopted by the Shop Stewards Conference

The Production Conference, held on 19th October, 1941, in the Stoll Theatre, London, (and dealt with on pages 456 and 466 in this issue) adopted the following four resolutions :

FOR INCREASED PRODUCTION

THIS National Conference of representatives from shipbuilding, ship-repair, aircraft, munitions, heavy and light engineering and allied trades whole-heartedly endorses the statement placed before the Conference.

We resolve to report to mass meetings of our members as quickly as possible the discussions and decisions of this Conference, using them as a guide and incentive to immediately increase production, and to mould the whole of the industry into a tremendous force against Hitler and for victory of the British and Soviet peoples.

We instruct the Council to issue for sale a pamphlet incorporating a report of the Conference and the Memorandum to the Select Committee of National Expenditure, to carry through a nation-wide campaign on the issues raised in the Conference and to use the columns of the NEW PROPELLOR to this end.

THE SECOND FRONT

To Mr. Churchill, Prime Minister.

THIS National Conference demands the opening up of a Western Front against Hitler as quickly as possible.

We pledge ourselves to continue our efforts to increase production to a degree that will guarantee both the maintenance of such a front, and material aid to our ally, the U.S.S.R.

GREETINGS TO RUSSIA

To the Soviet Embassy.

THIS National Conference of workers engaged in all sections of the engineering industry, embracing men and women from all parts of Britain, sends fraternal greetings to the people of the U.S.S.R.

Our admiration of your tremendous heroism and fierce fight against Hitler Fascism is not enough, and we pledge ourselves to continue our efforts to further increased production and take every measure that will guarantee quickly our joint victory over Fascism.

PRESS FREEDOM

THIS National Conference, representing over half-a-million workers employed in shipbuilding, ship-repair, aircraft, munitions, heavy and light engineering and allied trades endorses the decisions of the 26 Trade Unions who have demanded the lifting of the ban on the *Daily Worker*. We believe this paper can help us a lot in carrying through the policy of this conference for increased production.

BOOK REVIEWS

Honesty about the Colour Bar

The Colour Bar in East Africa: By Norman Leys. (Hogarth Press. 7/6.)

When Dr. Leys writes about East African conditions, it is up to the rest of us to listen with attention and respect. We may differ from his conclusions, and detect sociological weakness in the bases of his thought; we may consider his insight, which is liberal, Christian, and idealist, inadequate to the full task that challenges it. But here, quite plainly, we have a teacher scrupulously honest, in dead earnest, fearless, and perhaps inspired. What he does not know about the facts in his chosen field is not worth knowing. For forty years with unflagging energy and devotion and with a reckless disregard of self-interest he has championed the rights of Africans. Victimised and persecuted for their sake, he has never flinched, never let them down, never allowed the folly and malice of his enemies to turn his mind sour. We salute such constancy and courage, and the deep knowledge and true feeling on which they are grounded. All of us, except the case-hardened bigot, have much to learn from Dr. Leys. And the present book, which he sometimes seems to think of as his last, is in many ways his best.

He describes how, in spite of British official declarations affirming a policy of no discrimination on grounds of religion, race, or colour, the colour-bar has in fact spread like a weed over the entire field of East African life during the last fifty years. Every device of legislative enactment and administrative practice has been used to secure this result, and used by the very statesmen and officials who have simultaneously been proclaiming their adherence to trusteeship, fair play, and equal rights. To-day there is no corner, no crevice, in the social structure of East Africa where anti-African discrimination

DOCUMENTS OF THE MONTH

Conference of Engineering and Allied Trades SHOP STEWARDS NATIONAL COUNCIL

Summary of Points to be included in Memorandum to be prepared for submission to the Select Committee of National Expenditure.

1. Extreme gravity of war situation and its significance for the people of Britain.
2. Maximum production the condition for victory over Fascism, for fulfilment of obligations undertaken at Three Power Conference to supply the Eastern Front, and for preparations and carrying through of Second Front.
3. Responsibility of workers and workers' organisations for fulfilment of these obligations.
4. Tasks of shop stewards to protect the welfare of workers of this country; and for this purpose, for the defence of people of Britain, to support the U.S.S.R. and ensure maximum production.
5. Need of continuous explanation and propaganda in workshops to ensure that every worker is ready to set an example, of devotion and discipline. Examples of campaign of shop stewards and methods of workers resulting in *increased production.*
6. Immediate changes required to help in ensuring sustained effort for maximum production: and in the first place Production Committees in each workshop.
7. Need of full co-operation of managements with shop stewards: instances of results of good co-operation, and also of the reverse of this.
8. Removal of grievances and obstacles listed below to make it easier to reach maximum production and the elimination of scrap.
9. Piece-rates and bonus earnings not to be cut, as fear of this the greatest single obstacle to increased production.
10. Levelling up of low wages: instances to be given where this is crying need.
11. *Man-power.* Offensive to defeat Hitlerite Germany will require every soldier this country can train or arm; and therefore whole man-power to be made available, especially the vast reserves of women.
12. Hindrances to women entering industry (or the forces) viz., low wages, lack of day nurseries, long hours and resultant shopping difficulties: poor transport.
13. Training of women in industry: reluctance to train women so that they can become fully efficient workers and need to break down this reluctance.
14. Equal pay for equal work to be enforced.
15. The rate to be paid for the job, whether done by man or woman: but fact to be faced that complicated jobs at times have to be split up in such a way that simplified operations, which cannot all carry the same rate, become inevitable.
16. *Working hours*: case to be taken to avoid exhaustion, which can only impede production in the long run, bad effect of waiting time.
17. Working conditions: in many cases highly unsatisfactory and in some scandalously bad, e.g., canteens, ventilation, sanitation, lighting, heating, A.R.P., firewatching, etc.
18. Canteens: not yet existing in a large proportion, probably the majority, of war work factories. Where existing, inadequate, high prices, food insufficient for needs of workers or badly run. Instances to be given and remedies proposed.
19. *Transport* difficulties only partly remedied: instances to be given: need of greater use of existing powers.
20. *Billeting*: effect upon production of bad and/or expensive billets, especially upon newcomers in industry and *most of all upon women entrants*: and the means to overcome the obstacle.
21. Effect of Essential Works Order.
22. Bad planning of operations in factories with consequent hold-ups in production: bad distribution of machine and small tools and precision instruments.
23. Bad lay-out of machines, causing loss of time and output.
24. Need of more skilled supervision, and nucleus of trained operatives.
25. Bottle-necks in industry, requiring to be remedied by a number of measures affecting managements and regional and national controls.
26. *Managerial inefficiency*, as an obstacle to production: instances to be given: need of ruthless elimination of such elements in management.
27. *Regional Production Boards* to have greater powers and to exercise them ruthlessly without regard to any vested interests.
28. Overlapping, delays, schedule restrictions, red tape and competition between government departments as impediments to maximum production. Need of single plan for production enforced by over-riding authority to which all other departments in this sphere are subjected.
29. Effect of propaganda on production: present weaknesses: proposed remedies: what can be done in workshops by shop stewards.

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Donations received in October, 1941:

£61 : 14 : 11

It is a very sad fact that it is bad policy to praise the contributors to our Development Fund. In September, when the total dropped back to £52, we sent forth what we hoped was a melting appeal, and the amount in October was promptly doubled. Our congratulations in that month have sent the total back to the sixties again. Complacency should be one of the seven deadly sins: it is afflicting a large proportion of the population of this country just now, and it is apparently afflicting our readers as well. The number of Discussion Groups contributing, though keeping up to the same level as last month, has not increased, and is still only about ten per cent. of the total Groups.

Need we say more? Yes, we will just quote one letter: "Till we started to take *Labour Monthly* we didn't know what Socialism meant. Being just an agricultural worker of 50 years at work (I started at 10) we didn't get a lot of school." And now *Labour Monthly* is helping him to complete his education, and he sends us half-a-crown for the Fund.

	£	s.	d.
M. Christopher	0	2	6
Sanone	0	3	0
"An duine"	0	10	0
Enfield D.G.	0	15	0
Salisbury C.P.	1	2	6
Red Gunners	1	10	0
"E"	0	2	6
H. Morgan	0	3	0
N. D. Hunt	0	5	0
Church Worker	0	2	6
R. R. (N.W.11)	0	10	0
A. Thornton	0	5	0
J. Sinclair	0	5	0
V. B.	0	1	0
Hampstead Gdn. Sub. D.G.	0	2	6
E. Goldsworthy	0	4	0
M. Archbold	0	2	6
Bishops Stortford D.G.	0	7	8
M. Baillie	0	10	0
C. Robson	0	5	0
H. Haycock	0	14	0
W. Duncan	0	5	0
Dr. R. M. Lang	0	5	0
Orpington D.G.	0	5	0
J. B. (Chelmsford)	0	5	0
Harpenden D.G.	0	3	0
Bedford D.G.	0	3	0
R. B.	0	9	0
A. Wall	0	5	0
H. S. M.	0	2	0
R. C.	0	1	0
Stourbridge D.G.	0	7	0
Altrincham C.P.	0	5	0
E. Wharton	0	9	6
Anon. (Lanark)	5	0	0
T. W. R.	1	0	0
Sanone	0	2	0
G. M.	0	1	4
Four Soldiers	0	4	0
Highgate D.G.	0	10	0
A. P. V. Offices	0	4	0
Llanelly D.G.	0	4	6
Trowbridge D.G.	0	1	0
Hereford D.G.	1	2	6
Anon. (Kensington)	0	2	6
Willesden D.G.	0	10	0
Red N.C.O.	0	5	0
G. H. Bishop	0	4	0
C. R.	1	0	0
H. Feldt	0	3	0
Cheadle D.G.	0	11	6
H. A. R. D.	0	2	0
Aberdeen Transport Gp.	0	2	6
W. F. L. Smith	0	2	0
G. S. Robinson	0	9	0
O. Estensen	0	3	6
A. Corum	0	3	0
A. Walker	0	3	0
L. F. Blore	0	12	6
A. V.	0	4	0
S. Berry	0	10	0
R. C. A. S.	0	10	0
Gun	1	0	0
R. Turner	0	2	6
Penrith D.G.	1	0	0
Woodford D.G.	0	5	0
G. W. Schofield	0	3	0
Q. (Manchester)	0	5	0
N. Harrow D.G.	0	4	6
A. R. M.	0	5	0
R. R. (N.W.3)	1	0	0
Anon.	0	9	6
Acton D.G.	0	4	10
Red Private	0	5	0
Maidenhead D.G.	0	15	0
Sutton Coldfield D.G.	0	3	0
Mary Howard	0	6	6
C. Nunn	0	2	6
M. W. Grant	0	14	0
M. H. G. J.	6	0	0
Goring-on-Thames D.G.	0	4	6
Anon. (Warrington)	0	5	0
F. D. McCallum	0	5	0
An duine	0	10	0
Gruzya Uchiticlya	0	15	0
Anon. (Ware)	0	5	0
M. Christopher	0	2	6
J. Williams	0	3	0
A. O. M.	0	1	0
H. S. M.	0	2	0
R. C.	0	1	0
Brierley Hill D.G.	0	3	0
Forest Gate D.G.	0	5	0
E. P.	1	0	0
Edmonton D.G.	0	7	0
J. V. Ruffell	0	3	0
Worthing D.G.	0	2	6
Anon. (Whitchurch)	0	1	0
Edinburgh D.G.	0	7	8
S. Walmsley	0	10	0
Collection per C. Davis	0	10	0
Artilleryman	0	2	0
Church Worker	0	2	6
Banstead D.G.	0	7	6
Wellington D.G.	0	4	6
Goring-on-Thames D.G.	0	5	0
P. Cogan	0	4	0
M. Carritt	1	0	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
Twickenham D.G.	0	5	0
H. A. F.	0	15	0
Cardiff D.G.	0	14	0
Enfield D.G.	0	5	0
S. Clarkson	0	2	6
H. F. Shann	0	2	6
R. Pearson	0	2	6
L. G. P.	0	5	0
Red Corporal	1	0	0
Corporal	0	5	0
G. L. Jones	0	5	0
R. G. Benians	1	13	0
Sudbury D.G.	3	0	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To be published during November—

ON LENIN *by* STALIN

This short collection of speeches and articles has been out of print for many years. We re-issue it to-day on the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution as a tribute to the two greatest men of our time, for the qualities that Stalin so justly and nobly praises in the "mountain eagle," Lenin, are matched only by his own heroic devotion to the liberation of the oppressed peoples of the World.

★ ★ ★

How Moscow Was Won in 1917 • I. Mintz

This further chapter in the history of the great October Revolution will be welcomed by the many thousands of workers who have read Mintz's earlier booklet, *October 1917*. It is a graphic and accurate account of one of the most important stages in the Revolution, when the workers of Moscow first seized power with that glorious bravery which they and their sons are to-day once again displaying.

LAWRENCE & WISHART, 2 Southampton Place, W.C.1

NEW PAMPHLET

PRODUCTION FRONT:

What Can Be Done?

by Maurice Dobb, M.A.

3D

•

An important new contribution to the acutest problem before the people of Great Britain by the well-known economist and writer on labour questions.

•

PUBLISHED BY

"LABOUR MONTHLY," 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by The Hardy Press, Ltd., Commercial Road, Bournemouth.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED